THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 MARCH Vol. XLII

THE PASSING OF THE KING

We recall Admiral Sir Francis Bridgeman, G.C.B., Commander-in-Chief Home Fleet, A.D.C. to George V, saying that George V was 'a good Churchman.' Lady Bridgeman, who alone possessed the privilege of correcting him, said: 'He means that the King is a good Christian man.' From the religious point of view no truer description could be given of his son, George VI.

It has been predicted that the British monarchy would end if we had a genius on the throne. What George VI possesssed was something of more value than genius — a perfect understanding of his position as sovereign, and the duties it entailed. His motto was '*regnare est servire*' — 'Whosoever would be chief among you let him be your servant' (*Mt.* xx, 27). His ideal of service not only demanded continual toil but also infinite tact. Virtue without tact not only loses something of its quality but much of its influence.

'The rigid righteous is a fool,
The rigid wise another.'

But our King possessed another outstanding virtue; the courage which faces both danger and suffering. There is no finer scene in English History than the King standing amid the bombed ruins of the East End, expressing his sympathy to the crowds of homeless people, and their unflinching response: 'We can take it.'

In times of bereavement and disaster many derive consolation and calm from our English literature. It may be the Passion as related in St. Luke's Gospel, or the opening words of *St. John* xiv: 'Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me.' Others turn to Shakespeare: others to Milton's *Samson Agonistes*: others to Browning's *Easter Day*: others to

Clough's immortal verse: 'Say not the struggle nought availeth,' fewer to his *Easter Day* in Naples:

> 'Though dead, not dead;
> Not gone, though fled;
> Not lost, though vanished.'

We turned to Tennyson's *The Passing of Arthur*. It seemed to us best fitted to the occasion — its vision of

> 'Three Queens with crowns of gold'

mourning the King. And those prophetic lines reflecting the mutability of our era:

> 'The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
> And God fulfils himself in many ways . . .'

Some would prefer Tennyson's *Crossing the Bar* as most appropriate to a sailor king:

> 'Sunset and evening star,
> And one clear call for me!
> And may there be no moaning of the bar
> When I put out to sea.
>
> But such a tide as moving seems asleep
> Too full for sound and foam
> When that which drew from out the boundless deep
> Turns again home.'

There was one touch of comfort in the announcement of the King's death: that it took place in his sleep. It was Socrates, the pre-Biblical prophet of personal immortality, who declared: 'A night without dreams is better than the happiest day.'

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Religious Factor in Internationalism

All our ideologists to-day are internationalists but unhappily all are not in harmony. There are three species of internationalists — the Red, the Black, the White.

Viewed as they are to-day, the Higher Synthesis of these three internationalisms seems incredible if not absolutely impossible. If this be so human unity must depend on the triumph of one of them. As its religion is the most important factor in determining the moral quality of a civilization, and so ultimately its victory and survival in its struggle for existence in competition with other civilizations, the question of the quality of the religion of any civilization is of supreme importance. Consequently, the most profound problem for each of these three internationals is its religion.

As White Internationals, it will be objected that our judgment cannot be unprejudiced in making our decision. Our reply is that our decision is determined, not by theories but by the appeal to facts, all of which can be verified when no iron curtain intervenes. If we describe the religion of the Red International as a tyrannical materialism and the religion of the Black International as an imperialist ecclesiasticism[1] — the limitation of whose authority in each case is dependent upon the limitation of its power — we may be charged with gross injustice, yet each of these internationals, whether in Spain or in Russia, has demonstrated itself to be a persecuting totalitarianism.

The White International has not yet had opportunity to demonstrate its essential character as a world power. It aims at peace, freedom and humanity, and it does so by methods which are humane, pacific and enlightened, adumbrated by the educational methods of UNESCO. It is, however, our conviction that, comprehensive as it is, UNESCO is not enough. UNESCO has to face and solve the intensely difficult problem of Religion.

Of course those who know the History of Religion and all its immense varieties may regard this ideal of securing one religion for the White International as beyond the bounds of possibility. Others who regard religion as an individual possession with which no outsider ought to interfere will resent the ideal of a universal White Religion as the deadliest enemy of essential religion. On this occasion we must ask leave to by-pass both these classes of opponents. We are convinced not only that the White International needs a Religion but that it is possible for it to secure it. The primary question is what kind of religion must this White International Religion be?

As scientific students of the History of Religion and Comparative Religion, we are convinced that this White Religion must be seen as the outcome of religious evolution — the highest kind of religion so far manifest in human history, and yet possessing such continuity, vigour and many-sided potentiality as to justify the conviction that it can surpass and survive all its existing religious rivals. This means, in short, that it must be some form of the Christian Religion, and that form must be the Christian Religion in its most essential, universal and practically developed form.

There are several ways of defining, describing and presenting this, but the first thing to realize is the growing and insistent demand for it. In this connection we would venture to commend

[1] cf. Paul Blanshard's *Freedom and Catholic Power* reviewed in this issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

to our readers the last two chapters of Prof. Arnold Toynbee's volume *Civilization on Trial*,[2] dealing with 'Christianity and Civilization' and 'The Meaning of History for the Soul.'

Rational Mysticism for the Masses

Religions,[3] January to April, 1952, publishes the Presidential Address delivered by R. B. Henderson, M.A., B.D., who has succeeded the Marquis of Zetland as President of the Society for the Study of Religions. The theme of the address, 'Religion and the Masses,' is particularly opportune. The tendency in the Study of Religion during the century ending with 1951 has had in view the educated classes and the essential need for retaining them as adherents and propagators of the Christian Religion. This effort has not been without a considerable measure of success. This success has been due in no small degree to what used to be described somewhat contemptuously as 'Public School' religion. This system of education secured loyalty to ideals of Christian duty, humanity and justice in the great body of British administrators at home and abroad. It did not in many cases secure adherence to the ranks of what are called 'practising' churchmen, but it did secure reverence and loyalty for the great ideals of Christian character and conduct. No one widely and intimately acquainted with the administration of the British Empire can fail to contrast it in this respect with those of other colonising nationalities.

It is not, however, the authority of ecclesiastical orthodoxy but the indispensable value of Christian influence in the spheres of character and conduct which has been strengthened by this practical educational apologetic for the Christian religion among the upper and middle classes. But what the Christian religion in this country has been gaining on the swings it has been losing on the roundabouts, if our so-called 'working classes' may properly be described by the latter term.

'The silent desertion of the churches' has been making amazing strides in this country since the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The reasons for this 'desertion' (with one exception) cannot be dealt with here. They are too many and the Church of England is by no means to blame for all of them. But it is plain that to-day it is the masses who are in most urgent need of Christian conversion and not our scientists, historians, educa-

[2] Published by the Oxford University Press, 1948; 12/6.

[3] Edited by F. Victor Fisher (post free 3/8). Society for the Study of Religions, 26 Buckland Crescent, N.W.3.

tionists and professional men. Of course this Christian education of the masses must begin in the homes and be carried on in the national day schools. It is not evangelistic church missions, etc., but national education which can do and has to do the job. It is clear that our recently much-advertized 'Missions to the People' have been miserable failures. It is religious education combined with parochial ministration which the masses need.

We have reason, therefore, to be grateful to Mr. Henderson, a schoolmaster not only by profession but by vocation, for dealing with 'Religion and the Masses' in his Presidential Address. Mr. Henderson sees our religious situation as threatened by an avalanche of materialism with its erratics of obscurantism, and the question is how to substitute for this an enlightened spiritual and moral religion. Mr. Henderson is clear that we must have one religion for the whole people and that that religion must be the Christian religion derived from the eternal essentials in the religion of Jesus Christ as interpreted in the light of our modern scientific studies and personal mystical experience.

Our essential conviction as Christians is that Jesus Christ did in sober truth find out for us the true way of life. Our religious education must begin there, and it has to be primarily practical and experimental, putting to the test in our own behaviour the principles and practices which Jesus Himself taught and practised. This religion is of two kinds, mystical and rational.

> 'If we would solve the mystery of life we must not begin by ignoring one half of the mystery.' We must begin by being mystics, but 'our mystic experience must always be subject to the control of reason' (p. 14).
>
> 'Union with God is mysticism and it works. But it is rational mysticism — we are not allowed to ignore the reasoning powers which God has implanted in us. Rational Mysticism — is this the Religion of the Future? I wonder' (p. 16).

Chancellor Collins and the Creeds

Chancellor Collins of St. Paul's in an address on Christian freedom delivered to British and Overseas students in the Central Hall, Westminster, asserted that the Church of England makes 'the gravest possible error' in requiring acceptance of the Creeds as a condition of Church membership. This utterance, being widely reported in the Press, created an outburst of protest in clerical circles so serious as to compel the Chancellor to preach a sermon in St. Paul's on January 13 in justification of his plea for liberation from credal restrictions. This sermon, under the title 'The Greatest of These,' we publish in this issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

In the Convocation of Canterbury (Jan. 18) Canon Courtman

> 'asked the Prolocutor (Canon Whytehead) if in view of confusion caused to Christian people in general, and grief to the faithful, he could inform them how they might attempt to restrain certain dignitaries of the Church from using the cathedrals for stating their own opinions and in such a way as to give the impression that they were views generally accepted by the Church. . . .'

The Prolocutor ruled the question out of order, and Canon Courtman explained later

> 'that when asking the question he had in mind certain remarks made recently in St. Paul's Cathedral. Keen as a man might be to change some of the views held about the Creeds, he said the Church afforded him a way whereby he could bring the whole matter before the properly appointed body, which was Convocation, and so obtain its views, which were the only views that Church people should accept regarding faith and order in the Church' (*The Times*, January 19).

We do not question that the Prolocutor decided rightly, but we do question the soundness of Canon Courtman's subsequent comment. His claim for the authority of Convocation in the sphere of Church doctrine seems to us to be somewhat excessive when we recall that since the Reformation, Convocation has been twice suppressed — at first for 25 years and later for 150 years.

Anyone who realizes the difficulties which would beset Chancellor Collins if he tried to secure credal reform through the agency of the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation would certainly advocate another method. What about proceeding by means of Parliament and a Royal Commission? Or, better still, because more conciliatory to Anglo-Catholic convictions, why should not the House of Bishops in the Church Assembly take up forthwith this matter of the Creeds and their use and feel thankful to Chancellor Collins for having given them the opportunity to do so? This latter procedure, in view of the success achieved in the production of *The Shorter Prayer Book*, might secure a most beneficial solution of the problem of the Creeds in the Church of England to-day.

Leading Liberal Churchmen have secured from the Church authorities the right of liberal interpretation and even reinterpretation of the statements in the Creeds. They also secured in an earlier period great concessions in the formula of clerical subscription, which included the Creeds, but there is much more to be achieved in the field of (1) the liturgical use of the Creeds in the daily services and in baptism, (2) the authorization of alternative Creeds, (3) in the retranslation of the Conciliar Creed used at Holy Communion.

Our readers know that for many years past we have urged the need of reform in these spheres. We hope that the courageous and spirited plea of Canon Collins may secure from our Church authorities that remedial action which the urgency and importance of the problem demands.

The *Church Times*, in its issue of January 11, published a leading article entitled 'I steadfastly believe,' drastically criticizing Chancellor Collins. The title of the article recalls the following incident. In the Baptismal Service, a vicar, having put the credal questions and having received the prescribed response, 'All this I steadfastly believe,' interjected: 'Sorry, I don't.' Being reported to his bishop, and having been duly reprimanded, he replied: 'I know that liturgically I ought not to have said it, but a truthful impulse overcame me.'

More Christians wanted in the Church

Dean Selwyn, writing to *The Times* of January 22, in criticism of the plea of Chancellor Collins on behalf of doctrinal freedom in the Church of England, was answered on January 25 by the Rev. J. H. S. Burton, Chaplain of the Royal Free Hospital, W.C.1—an Oxford man who became Head of Cambridge House (1940-43) and has had wide experience amongst thoughtful laymen.

> Sir,—The Dean of Winchester writes in your columns to-day that he has 'never heard of a layman who wished to avail himself of the sacraments being subjected to a test of orthodoxy.' This is not the experience of many of us younger clergy who are not infrequently called upon to prepare young adults for the sacrament of baptism, since the Prayer Book service for adult baptism involves the candidate being challenged with the Apostles' Creed. In addition to those wishing to join the Church from other religious bodies there are an increasing number of unbaptized children of thoughtful parents to whom sincerity means more than orthodoxy.
>
> Quite clearly any religious body has the right to demand certain standards of belief and conduct from its adherents. The Apostles' Creed (though belonging to the sub-apostolic era of the early second century, as is generally agreed by scholars), in view of its traditional acceptance by the Church, is a convenient standard of belief provided that it is presented to the candidate with the liberality of interpretation allowed by the *Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine* published in 1937 after many years' work. But so long as such splendid Christian witness is given by religious bodies who do not use the Creeds (for example, the Society of Friends, the Salvation Army, and others) it is manifestly unsound to use the test of credal affirmation to discern the Christian, though quite legitimate to use it to define the Churchman. But these two terms are not, and presumably will never be, synonymous. Canon Collins, like so many of us, I think, wants more Christians in the Church.
>
> John H. S. Burton

If we would secure more Christians for the Church we must emphasize that entering the Church does not demand religious obscurantism nor traditionalist sectarianism. Baptism is the rite by which we are admitted into the Church of Christ, not merely into the Church of England.

MR. SMITH, OUR CURATE

In a parish magazine which must be nameless, the vicar writes thus to his parishioners with reference to the curate who is leaving them to take up parish work elsewhere :

> 'You will have heard that Mr. Smith is shortly leaving us. The Bishop of another diocese and the Vicar of another parish are anxious to have him, so we must let him go. He himself is naturally looking forward to his new sphere of work. It is nice to be wanted (so long as it is not wanted by the police).
>
> 'How shall we get on without him? — Mr. Smith conducting services, taking Sunday School, editing the Magazine; Mr. Smith tending the sick, wheeling their chairs, lighting their fires, writing their wills; Mr. Smith looking for lodgings and finding out jobs; Mr. Smith building cupboards, making notice-boards, putting up posters, carting furniture, shovelling coke, stoking the boiler, lopping trees, repairing hedges, making lawns. All these things will still get done in the future, of course, but with much delay, because there will not be the same willing horse.

Our readers will feel that the bishop who ordained Mr. Smith made no mistake, but we need to go back somewhat further into Mr. Smith's career. A graduate of an ancient University, trained for ordination in a theological college, Mr. Smith, having duly passed the General Ordination Examination, was first offered a title in a diocese differing widely from that in which he was ultimately ordained. Mr. Smith, however, failed to satisfy the bishop's examining chaplains, who assailed his orthodoxy on two issues regarded by his examiners as of paramount importance : (1) the Virgin Birth and (2) the Physical Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In his defence Mr. Smith maintained that the evidence was not convincing and that his hesitation to come out with 'a flat denial or an unblushing affirmation' was, in his opinion, no grounds whatever for doubting his strong religious convictions in the Divinity of Christ and in the reality of His Resurrection. Mr. Smith also referred his examiners to the *Doctrinal Report* on these points.

As a consequence, Mr. Smith was next examined by the Bishop of the Diocese and his senior examining chaplain, who as a result wrote to Mr. Smith as follows :

> 'After giving the matter anxious consideration and taking counsel at the highest level which was available, I do not feel that I can accept responsibility for your ordination in the face of your doctrinal position. . . . I have nothing but admiration for your honesty and sincerity, and

that from an ultimate point of view I regard these as far more important than a precise orthodoxy. But of course I have not to deal with the question on that plane but with the purely administrative one of admission to Holy Orders in the Church of this Diocese.'

This circumstantial narrative illustrates the discouragement ith which ordinands with liberal views find themselves faced at ıe present time in seeking Holy Orders in not a few dioceses. uch an experience can not only alienate the rejected ordinand :om loyal and sympathetic membership in his mother-church, but an also deprive the Church itself of a clergyman who possesses a ympathetic understanding of the religious outlook and religious eeds of the majority of the laity in his parish.

In view of the urgency of the existing situation in this sphere, iberal Churchmen have a right to demand from our diocesan ishops a definite declaration. Is a candidate for Holy Orders ho refuses to affirm his belief in the historical evidence for the irgin Birth and Physical Resurrection of Jesus Christ unfit to e ordained in the Church of England?

He openeth also their ear to discipline'

As the result of discussion in the Church Assembly, a Report n the 'Discipline of the Laity' has been presented to the onvocations of York and Canterbury. It culminates in the llowing code of six rules:

'1. To pray every day and to read the Bible regularly.

2. To join in the worship of the Church every Sunday, and to observe Holy Days.

3. To receive the Holy Communion regularly after due preparation, and more particularly at the great Festivals of the Church and on the great occasions of our own lives.

4. To mark Fridays, and the Season of Lent, by special acts of devotion and self-denial.

5. To contribute worthily to the work of the Church at home and overseas and for the relief of those in need.

6. To uphold the marriage laws of the Church, and to bring up children to love and serve the Lord.'

The Bishop of Carlisle when presenting the six rules in the ork Convocation emphasised that 'they were minimum rules.' r. Hunter, Bishop of Sheffield, protested that the Christian Reli- ion 'knows no minimum rules at all but demands the maximum l the time.' He also added that 'the Report lacked the powerful nd dynamic sense which they wanted to get back into their urches to-day.'

St. Paul, who wrote to the Galatians

'Ye observe days, and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain' (iv, 10, 11)

had he been present in Convocation might have taken an even stronger line than that of the Bishop of Sheffield.

The Son of Man who came 'eating and drinking' by His declaration: 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man' deprived dietetic regulations of all moral and spiritual authority.

The reason for the post-Reformation authorisation of a fish diet on fast days was not religious but economic and political. Its purpose was to keep up the numbers of our fishermen who, in their turn, provided competent sailors for the Royal Navy.

The phrase 'discipline of the laity' is an offence to English Church usage. The word 'discipline' does not occur in the New Testament and only once in the Old (*Job* xxxvi, 10). We know moreover that in order to secure support for the Canons of 1603 it was expressly affirmed that they were intended to discipline the clergy, not the laity.

The omissions from the six-rule Code, in view of the besetting sins of our evolving social situation, are serious. Nothing is said about the responsible use of money, leisure, athletics; nothing also is said of the evasion of the claims of national and local service; nothing is said about the advancement of the Kingdom of God at home and abroad as the supreme duty of Anglican Churchmen and as the inspiring bond of co-operation between them and non-Anglicans.

A National Church for Madagascar

Christianity in England has much to learn from Christian Foreign Missions. Madagascar is furnishing such a lesson at the present time. The London Missionary Society, founded in 1796, whose membership consisted of Evangelical Christians of various denominations, convinced of the duty of evangelizing the non-Christian world, began work in Madagascar in the last decade of the eighteenth century. The fundamental principles of the L.M.S. were formulated as follows in 1796:

> 'As the union of Christians of various denominations in carrying on this great work is a most desirable object, so, to prevent, if possible, any cause of future dissension, it is declared to be a *fundamental principle of the Missionary Society* that its *design* is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other forms of Church Order and Government (about which there may be differences of opinion among serious persons) but the *glorious Gospel* of the blessed God, to the heathen; and that it shall be left (as it ought to be left) to the minds of the persons whom God may call into the Fellowship of His son from among them to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the Word of God' (p. 67).

Since then Evangelical Missions, loyal to these fundamental principles, have carried on their work in Madagascar but they have

had many ups and downs. They had to endure bitter persecution from the Pagan rulers of the Malagasy. Not a few of the early converts suffered martyrdom; but in the end Christianity secured toleration, if not pre-eminence.

Later came the French occupation of the island which created unfavourable conditions for British Protestant Missions, and provided, not unnaturally, a favourable environment for Roman Catholic propaganda. After 130 years of missionary work there are only 1,500,000 Christians in Madagascar out of a total population of 4,000,000: of these 825,000 are Evangelicals and 700,000 Roman Catholics.

The Evangelicals although loyal to the fraternal Christian spirit of the L.M.S. are working as a number of independent groups. As a consequence they are finding that spiritual unity, if it be not embodied in a co-operative organization, is inadequate in the field of Christian propaganda when faced with a close-knit Roman Catholic organization on the one hand and the dead weight of hostile paganism on the other. Hence the Malagasy Evangelicals feel the need for securing 'one Malagasy Protestant Church.'

But how is this to be done?

This problem is discussed in the *Congregational Quarterly* of January, 1952, in an article entitled 'The L.M.S. and the Congregational Witness in Madagascar,' by J. T. Hardyman. As a Congregationalist Mr. Hardyman naturally considers the Congregationalist solution of the problem. He writes:

> 'One line of approach would be for the L.M.S. to remould the churches under its care to a firmer Congregational pattern.'

This solution Mr. Hardyman finds to be quite inadequate. It would tend to increase rather than abolish the situation of sectional weakness. He looks forward, however, to the creation of a United Protestant Church for North Madagascar consisting of the churches of the L.M.S., the M.P.F. (the Reformed Church of France), and the F.F.M.A. (the Friends).

> 'The result should be a richer understanding of Christianity and of church-life than is at present held by the churches of any one of these groups' (p. 27).

We can quite understand, in view of its totalitarian imperialism, why the Church of Rome should oppose this effort to secure a National Church for Madagascar; but it seems to us incomprehensible that Anglicanism and Lutheranism, both of which believe in National Churches, should refuse to co-operate with the Malagasy in their aspirations to create a National Christian Church for Madagascar.

IN MEMORIAM

HENRY FITZ-MAURICE

1886–1952

The Modern Churchmen's Union has lost a valued member by the death of the Rev. Sir Henry Fitz-Maurice, K.B.E., C.M.G., who, after a distinguished career in the Consular Service in the Far East (Siam, Indo-China and the Dutch Indies) was ordained in 1940 by the Bishop of Chichester and was presented by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury to the Vicarage of Brenchley, Kent, in 1943, which he held until his sudden death on January 20, 1952.

Joining the Modern Churchmen's Union shortly after ordination, his unique experience secured for him a leading place in its counsels and activities. He became Chairman of the Kent Branch and was thereafter elected a member of the Council of the M.C.U. He was 'a live Modernist' and a regular attendant at the Modern Churchmen's Annual Conferences, where his services as chairman were much appreciated. We shall miss him when we gather again at Bristol this year. He exemplified in his pastoral life the soundness of the policy of ordaining to the Church's Ministry laymen who have had a preliminary and honourable experience in non-clerical circles.

The writer of this notice once remarked to Canon Glazebrook: 'Canon J. M. Wilson, your predecessor at Clifton College, told me he had had the inestimable advantage of being a layman for 40 years before his ordination.' Canon Glazebrook replied: 'I was in my 39th year when I was ordained.'

And what a strength they were to enlightened liberal Churchmanship.

H.D.A.M.

THE PARADISE OF SECTARIANISM

By J. C. Hardwick

THE story of American Protestantism[1] begins with the settlement of the country, which took place at different times and in divers manners. The first permanent British colony on the mainland was founded on May 13, 1607, when 105 settlers landed at Jamestown, Virginia. Maryland was settled in 1634 by George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, who welcomed colonists on the basis of freedom of worship. The southernmost coast colony, Georgia, originated as an experiment in the 'Social Gospel.' The founder, General Oglethorpe, 'prosecuted philanthropy in the spirit of a paladin.' In response to his invitation to people of all creeds, a ship arrived in 1736 bearing a Moravian bishop, with Charles Wesley as Governor's secretary and his brother John as Anglican chaplain and Indian evangelist. John, however, behaved like a fool, imposing High Church discipline and practices on a frontier community that (apart from the Moravians) hardly knew the elements of the Christian faith.' At this date his knowledge of the world was confined to Oxford. He got into trouble with the law by excommunicating a girl who had jilted him. Five years later Whitefield arrived (Wesley had gone back home), bringing money for shoes, breeches, dresses, etc., for the settlers. He received a ready hearing.

During the Commonwealth, George Fox had visited Maryland, Rhode Island the the Carolinas, and Quakers became numerous along the Atlantic coast. The story of William Penn has often been told. On the death of his father (Admiral Penn) he was faced with the problem of extracting from Charles II a debt of £16,000. The debt was settled by the transfer of vast tracts of forest, appropriately named Sylvania. Penn was a good business man with a flair for publicity, which eventually became a national characteristic. He was an adept at 'selling' his ideas.

> 'Not content with Anglo-Saxon immigrants, he toured the Continent, offering a new home to hard-working peasants and artisans who were persecuted by Romanist or Lutheran governments.'

He accepted the idea of America as a 'melting pot' and would welcome even Roman Catholics and Jews provided they were willing to tolerate the opinions of others. His creed was a minimum — belief in God the Creator. There was nothing insular

[1] *Story of American Protestantism.* By Andrew Langdale Drummond. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh; 30/-.)

about Penn. His racial reconciliation policy was far in advance of his age. For him the Indians were backward 'children of God,' not savages to be exterminated or exploited. His treaty with the Indians was not so unique as has been suggested, but the fact remains that they remained loyal to him and his successors for seventy years — 'as long as the administration adhered to the spirit of the treaty.' It was in 1682 that he reached America in the *Welcome*. By 1700 no less than forty meeting houses had been erected, ranging from a room to a large hall. These useful productive citizens, to whom the 'inner light' gave poise and dignity, realized the type of the primitive church represented in the *Didaché*.

The name 'Pilgrim Fathers' was not coined till 1799, and up to the middle of the nineteenth century was applied indiscriminately to all the founders of New England. Historians now restrict the title to the pioneers of 1620 who crossed the Atlantic in the *Mayflower*, their successors being known as 'Puritans.' The voyagers themselves 'were definitely plebeian in origin.' Two-thirds were 'social misfits unable to make a living or at odds with the law.' They found regimentation irksome, 'especially in the new world.' In autumn they landed on the desolate shores of Cape Cod, Massachusetts. This landing 'marked the beginning of democracy in Church and State,' for no royal governor inaugurated the plantation. The *Mayflower* had been crammed as Noah's ark: of 102 who embarked, nearly half were dead after four months. After their first harvest (1621) a Thanksgiving was held, and the festival still survives. Nine years after, a fresh influx of English immigrants arrived, men who had found the yoke of Laud and Charles I intolerable; they represented a cross section of English society. The majority accepted the Puritan pattern of life. Though romanticized by Longfellow and Whittier, and sentimentalized by Felicia Hemans,[2] the New England Puritans were no 'pioneers of the freedom of faith,' for they 'outdid Laud in their utter lack of tolerance towards any who deviated from their doctrines and discipline.' The Cambridge Synod of 1638 catalogued no less than 82 opinions, 'some erroneous, others blasphemous, and all unsafe.' Anglicans, Quakers, Baptists all came under the same condemnation. For the latter two sects scourging, branding and mutilation were the alternatives to exile. These theocrats were implacable; they denounced 'the hideous

[2] This English versifier received a greengrocer's parcel, wrapped in a Boston newspaper. Fascinated by reading therein an account of Forefathers' Day (1824), she was inspired by the Muse to write a poem. No wonder historians questioned her accuracy: she never visited America.

amour for liberty of conscience.' One of the most popular New ngland books was Wigglesworth's *Day of Doom* (1662). In easing jog-trot metre it painted a lively and sadistic picture of ell. A ghastly poem, it was 'the solace of every fireside,' and as considered only second in inspiration to the Bible.

In 1739 a new prophet reached Philadelphia — the evangelist Whitefield. This city, the largest in British North America, had sen, on Quaker foundations, to 'prosperity, amenity and cul- re.' Its leading citizen was Benjamin Franklin, the first 'typical merican' and a Deist. The city was enthralled by the young reacher's dramatic technique, and theatre, concert room, dancing hool were closed 'as inconsistent with the Gospel.' Whitefield uld collect money as well as vast congregations, but philanthropy as secondary to 'hunting in the American woods after poor nners.' The climax of his tour was his visit to Jonathan Edwards Northampton in western Massachusetts. Edwards had prepared e way and 'almost extirpated recreation,' dwelling on 'the ternity of Hell's Torments,' etc. But Whitefield pitied the orched earth and spoke of the consolations and privileges of ith. When he left in 1741 for the old country, he had caused reams of revival to flow from Georgia to the Canadian border. was a Great Awakening.

But the trouble was that though Whitefield was ecclesiastically oad, theologically he was narrow—a throw-back to seventeenth- ntury Puritanism. In England the leaders of orthodox dissent ere all aware of his conceit and lack of judgment; and once the amour of his personality was removed from the American scene e fierce sectarian spirit reawoke, reinforced by awkward displays mass hysteria. The candle soon burnt down to the socket.

The possibility of bishops being sent across the Atlantic was ways a bogey to non-Anglicans; and as the Government of eorge III and the American colonies came to loggerheads, stility to the idea of bishops grew. Not all 'Churchmen' wanted episcopate; and for many colonials the Church was a Trojan orse intended to destroy their cherished institutions. On the out- eak of the American Revolution upwards of 80,000 'Church and ing' loyalists migrated to Canada and the West Indies. These ere mostly property-holders and officials; poor Churchmen were ore inclined to throw in their lot with the 'rebels.' Yet two-thirds those who signed the Declaration of Independence were Angli- ns — Alexander Hamilton, Madison and Washington among em. Among the smaller Protestant denominations, the Baptists ere strongest for American Independence; they had suffered uch from Anglican intolerance. The Revolution brought to an

end the dependence of American denominations on ecclesiastical authorities in Europe. Gone was the link which bound the Episcopalians to the Bishop of London.

Meanwhile the pure gospel of Calvinism was being diluted. By 1780 there was only one Congregational minister in Boston who taught the pure doctrine; latitudinarianism from England had seeped in. Tillotson's sermons were read. Though in England Unitarianism was inclined to be left-wing in politics, in New England it became the religion of those who were conservative in everything but theology. King's Chapel, Boston, the stronghold of Tory Anglicanism, was a strange nest for hatching the first New England Unitarians, but so it turned out. The Boston tradition became Unitarian; Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes and Hawthorne were all of this faith. Yet after its rapid expansion in eastern Massachusetts, Unitarianism did not proselytize on a wide front, but acted as a leaven of liberalism on churches still creed-bound. It produced essayists, novelists, philosophers, prophets, poets and hymn-writers like Whittier and the Rev. Samuel Johnson.

Methodism, unhampered by cultural or theological handicaps, went ahead in the semi-barbarous South-west, where they preached 'full and free salvation to all.' Poor child of an aristocratic Church, Methodism was ardent, while her mother was cool and conventional. On the frontier they took their religion neat. Methodist 'circuit riders' had to be both tough and fervent. 'We murdered the King's English at almost every lick,' said Cartwright, 'but there was a divine unction.' This doughty evangelist could quell a riot, and thereafter preach so that three hundred fell, 'like dead men in a battle.'

Meanwhile, New England proved a seed-plot of strange new cults: Second Adventism, Mormonism, Perfectionism, Christian Science. During the 'thirties and 'forties of the nineteenth century all kinds of idealistic and utopian schemes flourished and wilted like Jonah's gourd. In following the frontier, religion was 'Americanised.' Refinement, esteemed in the East, was ridiculed in the West. Those who 'got religion' wanted it hot and strong, with no cultural barriers between them and their preachers. Ignorance was an asset. Later, as the West settled down, business efficiency took the place of 'enthusiasm' in the churches.

During the Civil War religion was to the fore on both sides. 'Stonewall' Jackson (a Presbyterian) and Robert E. Lee (an Episcopalian) were fervent Evangelicals. At night the camps resounded with hymns. But when the war was over, the horrors of 'peace' followed. For ten years the South lay prostrate under

military dictatorship. It was the Baptists who won the hearts of the emancipated negro. These people

> 'made a unique contribution to American Protestantism in emphasising what Americans are only too ready to forget — suffering is a way by which God often leads his children.'

Negro spirituals have indeed been a unique contribution.

The Civil War, look at it how you may, was a tragedy for America, one from which, perhaps, she has never recovered.

> 'The United States emerged from the Civil War a changed nation. Not only was the old order overthrown in the South. The East was being rapidly industrialised. Active New Englanders moved West and a tide of immigrants from Europe flowed into their place and submerged old landmarks. A polyglot population, largely Roman Catholic, swarmed in the former strongholds of the Puritans.'

Owing to the disastrous casualties of the war, the old Anglo-Saxon stock had been decimated; a foreign-born proletariat took their place. It is true that material civilzation developed rapidly. Refrigerators, 'elevators,' gramophones, proved it. Mark Twain called it 'The Gilded Age,' an epoch of unparalleled opportunity and optimism. Jay Cooke, Pierpont Morgan, Vanderbilt, J. J. Astor — the seigneurs of the Almighty Dollar — came into being. Most of them had Church connections, and there were lavish benefactions for higher education and for religious objects. There was nothing in the States corresponding to the Christian Socialism of Maurice and Kingsley, though towards the end of the century their ideas were proclaimed by men like Francis G. Peabody, and even in fiction, as in the novelist Winston Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup*. But as a whole the ramparts of Anglo-Saxon tradition were breached by Italians, Irish, Central Europeans, Poles, as they crowded into the melting-pot.

Revivalism had always been the dominant pattern of American Protestantism since the days of Whitefield, and it beat upon American life in a series of waves. Evangelism culminated in the campaign of Moody and his imitators after the Civil War. The kindling flame was spread by his associate, Ira D. Sankey, author of *Sacred Songs and Solos*. They were an ideal combination; their imitators had little of their big-heartedness and willingness to co-operate with men of different views. There was that prophetess of the 'Four Square Gospel' — a twentieth-century exponent of religious vaudeville — Aimée Semple McPherson. Her 'Angelus Temple' was the embodiment of high-pressure salesmanship, with an adroit use of spot-lights, music and pageantry *à la* Hollywood. Pastor Russell, too, started up his 'Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society,' and its effective propa-

ganda transmitted throughout the land a vulgar parody of Christianity.

> 'Russell was as successful among the poor as Mrs. Eddy among the rich. The rich wanted a mind at ease so as to derive more satisfaction from life: the desperately poor, having nothing more to expect from life, looked for a cosmic cataclysm that would make them masters of the world in the millennial reign of Christ.'

'Millions now living will never die' was a good slogan, 'put over' by radio, loud-speaker vans, cheap literature and all the apparatus of modern propaganda. Jehovah's Witnesses have had a good run; but of course there are no poor in U.S.A. to-day, and popular education has done something to reduce the margin of suggestibility and hysteria. Not but what Fundamentalism flourished, and secured as its apostle the whirlwind orator W. J. Bryan, Presbyterian elder and Democratic candidate for the Presidency. The issue of a 'cover to cover' literally inspired Bible was focused with dramatic intensity in the notorious trial at Dayton, Tennessee (1922). But Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick of New York became the bugbear of the Bible belt. His published sermon, 'Shall the Fundamentalists win?' created a sensation. The General Assembly requested him to quit preaching in Presbyterian pulpits; but his supporters built him a church. America produced some high-powered preachers; when Phillips Brooks came to England, the Abbey and St. Paul's were crowded. His was 'a generous, manly soul.' As late as 1900 the American pulpit occupied a strategic position in national life. The Sabbath was still well observed, save in certain cities where Roman Catholic immigration had breached the walls. There were no such engrossing alternatives as exist to-day. Monday's papers always devoted space to 'Yesterday's Sermons.'

> 'Taking the United States as a whole,' writes Dr. Drummond, 'it can be safely said that preaching attracts a larger proportion of the population than in Britain, nor has the slump in church-going gone so far.'

The feature in American religion which chiefly strikes the reader of this fascinating volume is its *vitality*. There may at times be crudity and 'enthusiasm,' but there is a zest and heartiness about it all which is largely absent in the more sophisticated atmosphere on this side of the Atlantic. Perhaps it is that we are older, and a trifle disillusioned, as well as too cautious to throw ourselves at once into the arms of an evangelist. We have even waxed cool towards 'Frank' Buchman the ex-Lutheran, 'this dapper, well-manicured surgeon of the soul,' though he did have a pretty good run here before the war.

But the book is a masterpiece, and should be studied by all who wish to understand an important side of American life.

A SECOND JANE: E. H. YOUNG

By Rheby

'SHE saw life steadily and saw it whole.' This is what *The Times* said of E. H. Young. Of course, it was first said by Matthew Arnold of Sophocles, and no single sentence could give a truer picture of Emily Young and of her work. She belongs to that creative minority — Sophocles is the prototype — of writers whose even-balanced minds, in full knowledge of all the tragedy of the world, still see life steadily and see it whole.

Who can explain this mysterious inspiration that makes supreme artists, as distinct from mere craftsmen? There are some few here and there who seem to catch fire. And what must they do if this inspiration does come? The Spirit bloweth where it listeth. The effects are there for all to see — if only they have eyes which can see — but the Muse herself, the Spirit — whence and what is it?

It was my privilege to see each one of the thirteen masterpieces of E. H. Young taking shape; I read them all over and over again — for they went through many stages before being presented to the public — from first word written to last word printed. She seemed to be under the influence of some outside power, *daimon* was the word Kipling used. He borrowed it from the Greeks. You can't expect me to show you how the *daimon* works. That is the artist's secret. E. H. Young was in her thirtieth year when her first book, *A Corn of Wheat*, was published by Messrs. Heinemann in 1910. What had she been doing up to that time? She was gradually preparing herself for the work of a writer—she was reading Plato, she was reading modern philosophers — all of them — Descartes, Hume, Berkley, up to Kant and Hegel. She was reading Logic and so forming habits of careful thinking and accurate observation. It was not until her twenty-sixth birthday that she actually began to write stories in earnest. They took the form of fortnightly essays. It was clear from the very first essay — even the very first paragraph — that here was some power at work quite out of the ordinary. She let it grow, tending it carefully, still waiting for her *daimon* to command her to begin. Then she wrote her first long novel.

There is plenty of inspiration in *A Corn of Wheat*, but Emily Young thought that there was much yet to learn. She saw defects of workmanship in this first published book and she would not allow it to be reprinted. The defects are there, but it's a powerful

novel all the same; and there were many critics who hailed it with delight, knowing that it promised great things to come.

They came. The second work, *Yonder*, showed E. H. Young in almost her full maturity. As one critic said: 'It has a well proportioned body and a lovely soul' — no bad description of the author herself if he had known it, but Emily Young determined from this early time that her works were to stand or fall on their own merits. She would have no advertisement of herself and she maintained that attitude to the end. Of course she was right, but it has not made it easy for lovers of her books to get them properly known. As one reviewer put it: 'There has been no trumpeting.' No, there certainly has not — she wouldn't allow the trumpets to sound — but, now that she has been taken from us, we may surely be allowed to take a look at her methods. The quest will take us very near to the innermost secrets of an artist's inspiration. The novelist must hold up the mirror to society and that mirror must not distort the picture, but for the really great artist this is not enough. Creation goes far beyond imitation, however accurate such imitation may be. Certainly for E. H. Young mere re-presentation was not enough. To her there was behind it all what Plato called the Form of the Good. Nothing could be further from her thought and her intention than preaching, yet she had a mission — to portray the truth, but to portray it in the light of a Divine Illumination.

She was therefore a slave — slave to her *daimon* — and it followed from this that she was mistress of all else. This explains her attitude towards criticism. When this criticism was favourable, as it generally was, she said, 'It won't do me any harm — I don't believe it.' When the criticism was unfavourable, she took it to her innermost shrine, presented it there, and examined it in the light of her truth. Is this right? she seemed to say. Nearly always the answer came: 'No, it's wrong, ignore it,' and ignore it she did. Many were the suggestions made to her by friendly critics while the work was in progress; all were welcomed, some accepted, but more often they were rejected. Never once was she ultimately proved wrong. Twice she accepted a criticism of a major kind. The first related to her very first publication and, as we have seen, she refused to have the book reprinted. On the other occasion the criticism reached her before publication — it came from Edward Garnett. She wrote the whole book again. That book was *The Vicar's Daughter*.

Everything was grist to her mill — all the people that she met, however casually, were fitted out with a complete history. Even animals and inanimate objects were playfully endowed with souls.

A few weeks in a stable produced *The Grey Mare*, a short story which few can read without emotion. All these experiences were going in — right deep down into her consciousness — but the next phase is harder to explain. It can't be explained; it is and must for ever remain a secret, for at that point something the Greeks would have called the Muse takes charge and dramatizes all the various little bits of men and women and things that have gone in. It is at that stage especially that the character of the artist comes into full play.

It is so easy to interfere with the work; it is so painful to follow the truth. All the characters of E. H. Young are new creations; they are not copies of people whom the artist has met in the outside world. They are born anew, and giving birth is always a painful process. It certainly was with E. H. Young, and, like most mothers, she would not have had it otherwise. This devotion to truth enabled her to reach down into the very depth of human nature and there grasp just the right mixed bundle of motives to produce the actions which take place.

Sometimes readers have complained that in the works of E. H. Young there *are* no actions. A poor fellow once said of her books: 'Only a lot of women talking.' Well, there are some men as well —but what this man didn't see was that the really important and interesting actions are just those which take place within. Externally there is very little happening to the characters in these works; very little, that is, which might not happen to any one of us. But that is not a weakness. On the contrary, it is a main source of strength to anyone who can see the greatness of little things, which means seeing the greatness of life. That is exactly what E. H. Young sees, and anyone who reads her work must be prepared to do some hard thinking. Nothing is there without a purpose; every paragraph is carefully designed, either to forward the story or to bring out some facet of a character—something necessary for the part that character has to play in the whole picture. The author doesn't tell us all she knows. To her, the whole history of each character lies open from birth, but she will only tell us the little bit that is needed for the design of the whole book. Running through it all, too, is a wonderful vein of humour. Humour is such an individual affair that it always defies classification.

E. H. Young's wit is elfin wisdom; it sparkles and crackles throughout her work. You never know when or where or how it is going to break out. Sometimes it reminds of Jane Austen without the faint suspicion that Jane is sometimes funnier than she knows.

E. H. Young's characters are so much alive that it quite shocks some people to be told that they are all her own creations.

'Of course,' many people have said, 'she must have been intimately acquainted with the inside of such a home as that presided over by the successful preacher Robert Corder.' But E. H. Young had never known such a household — it grew up entirely in her own mind. Readers of *A Corn of Wheat* think they know exactly what a revival meeting must have been like in pre-war times; it's so vividly described in the book. Yet Miss Young had never been to one.

And what lovely sentences she uses; each one carefully balanced in itself, each word given its own correct weight and the whole fitting into the complete pattern. No wonder that readers go back to her books again and again, and no wonder that they gather fresh delight with each successive visit. And the delight meets them in the first chapter — it never fails. Take chapter one of *William*, for instance; there we are introduced to William himself, then to his wife Kate and the numerous daughters. We become dimly uneasily aware of trouble coming from and to these young women. There is a note of danger, yet we feel that William is just the man to deal with it all; and the setting, all of Hotwells and of Clifton and much of Bristol, has already become part of the story.

Yet it is *Miss Mole* that affords the proper opportunity for a description of Clifton. Could anything be more utterly satisfying than the first chapter of *Miss Mole*? In it we have Clifton in all its charm made so plain to us that those who have never seen the place can yet feel at home in it — and there, in the middle, is the solitary, pathetic figure of Hannah Mole. 'Pathetic,' perhaps, but not quite helpless—we shall see. And then *Chatterton Square* — Canynge Square with a difference — Canynge Square as seen in a dream : the two houses connected by the queer little flat-roofed room, but also connected — oh so delicately — by the intangible threads of thought passing like messages along telegraph wires from one house to the other—to and fro—to and fro—action and reaction — friendly and hostile — and we know that we are to be involved in the destinies of those two families. Nothing happens —yet everything happens. Lives are made and unmade while the lions in the Zoo roar, the steamers on the river hoot, and men in the busy world outside — for want of just such a little bit of the wisdom shown by these 'women talking' — get themselves ready for a battle which will shake this same busy world to its foundations.

From 1938 Emily Young wrote nothing — from Munich till the tide turned at Alamein — except for two books for and about children. She just felt that she couldn't write — the shame and

egradation of what seemed to her to be a base surrender simply roze her genius. She recovered just in time to write *Chatterton Square* — and then she died.

To reveal anything about Emily Young's private life would e to go against her dearest wishes : but this much may be said — he was one whom to know was to love, and in her life she knew he extremes of joy and sorrow.

Children always—and animals often—gravitated towards her s if drawn by invisible threads. She had a transforming influence n those she met — even casually. This was well expressed by a usiness man who said : ' When she came in, I ceased to be a nerchant and became a man.'

BIBLE REVISION

By Roderic Dunkerley, B.D., Ph.D.

IT is seventy years since the Revised Version of the New Testament was published, and it is now quite clear that it has not become and has not any chance of becoming the loved and generally used English version. A new translation is being undertaken, we understand. Has it any chance of better success?

A famous dean of those days spoke of the Revised Version as ' the most astonishing as well as the most calamitous literary blunder of the age.' Is there any possibility of the new undertaking escaping some of the errors of the old, and winning a much greater measure of popular approval and even affection?

If that were so, it would be a real contribution to the revival of religion in our land. One aspect of the decline of religious faith and practice amongst us has been the neglect of Bible reading, and one reason for this has been the old-fashioned language of the usual version combined with the common notion that it was authoritative in a way that the modern versions were not.

The first mistake about the Revised Version was that it was undertaken far too late. This was not the fault of the Revisers, but if they had realized it they might have acted differently and at least attempted to minimise the difficulty of the situation that had been created long before, instead of intensifying it as they actually did.

The point is this. The Authorised Version was of course itself a revision of the earlier English versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, and the rest. And it was not itself regarded at first as in any way a final and definitive translation of which there could subsequently

be no amendment or modification. Revised editions of it appeared in 1762 and 1769, 'in which the text was carefully revised,' Kenyon says, 'the spelling modernized, the punctuation corrected, and considerable alteration made in the marginal notes.' 'These two editions . . . formed the standards for subsequent reprints of the Authorised Version, which differ in a number of details, small in importance but fairly numerous in the aggregate, from the original text of 1611.'

Now, the obviously right thing was for this process of progressive improvement to have been continued and such revisions made every fifty or a hundred years. This would have ensured a reasonably up-to-date Bible all the time, keeping pace with the inevitable changes in phraseology and with the advance of scholarship. Each fresh revision would have had a good chance of being accepted as the 'New Authorised' version. And it would not have been possible for the 1611 version to become regarded as sacrosanct, as in fact THE Bible, to the exclusion of all other versions—which is, of course, the way in which it has commonly been thought of by the majority of ordinary simple-minded Christians.

This is the recognized process of Bible translation followed in other cases than the English Bible. Every year in the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society there are statements about new translations into fresh languages or dialects, and about revisions of earlier translations in view of the missionaries' fuller understanding of the idiom of the people among whom they are working. It is the obvious, natural, sensible way of doing things. How regrettable it is that our ecclesiastical authorities failed us in this respect years ago.

The long gap that had elapsed since the last revision was quite sufficient in itself to make the task of the Revisers in 1881 extremely difficult, but they made things much worse by the way in which they tackled the job. The number of changes they introduced was undoubtedly excessive. The chairman of the Revisers' Committee, Bishop Ellicott, in persuading Convocation to undertake the work of revision, mentioned one alteration for each verse, on the average, as the utmost that might be expected. Actually the number (in the New Testament) amounted to 36,000, or four and a half per verse. Perverse indeed! This was practically equivalent to a re-writing of the book, and it is no wonder that it failed to win general approval or in any degree to supersede the old version.

And the shock for the simple reader was increased by the nature of a great many of the changes, and by the marginal notes explaining them. A considerable number of words and even

erses, familiar and well-loved, were omitted because, the margin ated, they were not found in certain ancient authorities. In some ses they were omitted without any note or explanation at all, as r example the words in the story of St. Paul's conversion, 'Lord, hat wilt Thou have me to do?' (*Acts* ix, 6). Sometimes, while pt actually omitted from the text, a note raised an unfortunate oubt about them, as in the case of the lovely prayer from the oss, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' (*Luke* xxiii, 34).

I sympathize very much with Dean Burgon's scornful comment n these notes: 'Undeniable at all events it is that the effect which ese ever-recurring announcements produce on the devout reader Scripture is the reverse of edifying, is never helpful, is always ewildering.' They may be criticized, however, not simply on is ground of expediency, but on grounds of scholarship also. It not by any means certain that the Revisers were always right in eir judgment of the textual evidence for and against certain adings. They were, of course, dominated by Westcott and Hort, t the science of textual criticism has advanced a good way since en, and while many of their decisions were no doubt right, others ay certainly be deemed at least questionable.

For example, take the omission from *Luke* ix, 54-56 of the ords '. . . even as Elijah did? . . . Ye know not what manner of pirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's ves but to save them.' The evidence against these words is by o means conclusive and a good case can be made out for think- g them original. They might easily have been omitted by certain crupulous scribes on the ground that they appeared to state that e disciples were of a different spirit from Elijah — in other ords, that they gave support to the Marcionite heresy that the od of the Old Testament was not the God of the New. Another nsideration in their favour is that Gospel incidents, or 'para- igms' as they are now sometimes called, almost invariably reach eir climax in some striking word of Jesus, and it would be ractically unparalleled for this to end in the abrupt manner of the evised Version. I hope the words will be retained in the new ersion.

But there is another point of considerable importance which is ften overlooked in this connection. Assuming that on the whole e text of the Revised Version, as distinct from the actual trans- tion, is purer than that of the Authorised Version, *i.e.* is nearer o what was originally written, where is the absolute necessity that e should retain such a text nowadays? For scholars, certainly; ut for ordinary preachers and people why should we bother so

much about this matter? Why make such a fetish of the text of the autographs, especially when the autographs are no longer extant and there is so much doubt about what they contained?

If there is any peril to Christian faith and practice through reading the *textus receptus*, by all means let us remove the stumbling-blocks in favour of the truer and more helpful form of words. But cases of this kind are probably very few. Many cases are quite trivial, and merely annoy readers who miss familiar renderings which are often more pleasing to the ear than the 'more correct' rendering. For example, the omission of the words 'praising and' from *Luke* xxiv, 53; it is a case of conflation, you say, two types of text combined to give us the familiar form. That may be so, but what difference does it make to the sense if we cut out these words and lose the better sounding phrase which they give?

Occasionally the old form of text is actually a correction of that judged the original; why should we retain the error of the original in place of the reading which puts the matter right? The change in *Mark* i, 2 is a clear example: 'in Isaiah the prophet' may originally have been written, but later copyists saw the error and rightly changed it to 'in the prophets.' Why should we go back on them? Wherein lies the value of perpetuating a foolish error? A collector of first editions was once shown a recent purchase by a somewhat inexperienced friend. 'Ah,' he said, 'you have got the bad edition. It has not got *les fautes* which are in the good edition!'

An historical study of the text no doubt has its place, but too big a place is surely being accorded to it if we ignore all the emendations and elaborations that were introduced in very early days and which have helped many through the centuries to understand and love the book. By all means let us record what seems probably the earliest form of the text, but for devotional, homilectic, and didactic purposes let us retain as far as possible the unique beauty of the English Bible to which our fathers owed so much.

After all, this is substantially what we do with the investigations and findings of the Higher Criticism. Scholars note them and to some small extent hand on the most valuable of them to preachers and their hearers. But we do not dream of printing the Bible with the two parts of *Isaiah* separated or the intricacies of *Hosea* sorted out. Why then should we insist on printing it without the small additions and amendments made at Rome or Antioch or Caesarea in the second century, quite possibly on very good grounds or for very sensible reasons? We cannot really get back

the original writers' words in the one case—then why should we ake such an emphasis upon them in the second?

There are points of similarity between the Bible and a athedral. Both are works of beauty given to us by the Spirit of od through the hands and minds of many faithful servants rough many long years. In neither case is its glory now such as ose who first started to make it could have envisaged. In each se those who use it prayerfully find much blessing. We do not ip off fragments of the cathedral here and there because they ere added later than some particular date. And why should we o such a thing in the case of the Bible?

What, then, should we desire as regards this business of Bible evision? My views will, of course, be dubbed crying for the oon, but I believe there is a certain value in knowing what should e done even though the powers that be prevent it.

We should have a 'New Authorised' version, prepared by the urches and authorised to be used in them, it being clearly stated d widely made known that it is the old English Bible, of Tynale and the others, slightly varied in language here and there by e removal of archaisms, discrepancies, and so forth. As well as e ordinary edition for pulpit and general use there should be a udy edition containing an appendix, to which all the textual otes should be relegated — and these should be in many cases ller and clearer than in the Revised Version. The two columns n a page plan should be scrapped because it gives such a dull nd heavy look to what ought to be attractive and forthright. hapter and verse divisions I would personally retain, as they are o rooted in common usage and on the whole so well made. But e chapter headings should be rewritten, and sub-headings disersed through the text, somewhat as in Weymouth's version.

In such a form the Bible would have a far greater chance of gain becoming the beloved treasure of the English people — ven of Tyndale's boy driving a plough—than the old Authorised r the Revised or any of the modern versions. It would not in self create that hungering and thirsting for the Word of God for hich we long. But it might well help towards that, and when in ue time that happens it would surely become a means of grace o many.

But no doubt the pedants will stand in the way!

THE GREATEST OF THESE*

By Canon L. J. Collins, Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral

'By their fruits ye shall know them. Not everyone that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven . . . Everyone, therefore, which heareth these words of mine and doeth them shall be likened to a wise man which built his house upon the rock . . . And everyone that heareth these words of mine and doeth them not shall be likened to a foolish man which built his house upon the sand . . .'

EVERYONE that heareth these words of mine: what are these words? Love God: love your neighbour. Love is the keyword of the New Testament. Love is the fulfilling of the Law. If a man say, I love God and hateth his brother he is a liar: for how can a man say I love God whom he hath not seen if he love not his brother whom he hath seen? If ye love me, keep my commandment. Christ's commandment is that we love one another; to keep his commandments is to love. The kernel of our Christian religion is love. By our faith, our trust, in Jesus we learn what God is like; we see Him in the face of Jesus, we see that God is love: and by our faith in him we learn that to love God is to love man, and to love man is to love God. We cannot love God if we do not love man: we cannot love man with the love revealed in Christ except we love God and allow Him to pour out his love through us — Christ is the vine and we are the branches.

The essence of true religion is, then, to love, to love with the love of God. And we Christians believe that our religion is unique just because in Christ we think we have the true pattern of what God is like and what man is like, and the true instrument for the outpouring of God's love into our world of affairs. The main test, therefore, of whether a man is a Christian is the fruit of love he bears in his life — not the affirmations he makes about his faith. A fig tree cannot bear thistles nor a briar olives. No matter what we profess to believe, or, indeed, what we believe we believe, our basic faith will be manifest in our works. To say that we believe Jesus is Lord and to bear no fruit of love is to utter a lie.

At the heart of love is freedom. For only that which is freely given is of the nature of real love. Is it love to give myself to God for fear that, if I deny Him, He will condemn me to fires of hell, or for the desire of the reward of heaven? Is it love to serve my brother because I am constrained to do so by external authority which I dare not disobey? Or shall we find a closer

* Sermon preached in St. Paul's on Sunday, January 13, 1952.

uch with truth in the words of Goethe, 'This preoccupation ith immortality is for people . . . who have nothing to do. But n able man, who has something regular to do here, and must toil nd struggle to produce day by day, leaves the future world to self, and is active and useful in this'? Or a greater sympathy ith this Hasidic story: 'When Rabbi Baer's wife pressed her arving child to her bosom, the Rabbi heaved a rebellious sigh. orthwith a voice from heaven thundered into his ear, "Thou ast lost thy share in the world to come." "It matters not," said e Rabbi joyfully, "the thraldom of reward has gone; henceforth will serve God as a freeman"?'

If I am to love I must be free, free of restrictions which spoil me the image of my Creator, and free of compulsions which eny to me the right and the power to be myself. Christ, the attern of human life, is the way, the truth and the life. I as a eliever in Him must be free to follow in His pattern.

It is in this setting that we must decide upon the question of hat place in the life of the Church the Creeds should take. A few ays ago, to a delightful audience of nearly three thousand young eople from 15 to 18 years of age, I expressed the opinion that it an error to insist upon the acceptance of the Creeds as a con- ition for membership of the Church of England, and that it is religious to suppose that in order to be a Christian a person must ubscribe to a particular intellectual statement of the faith. As a esult of my remarks I have found myself under fire from all irections, the object of abuse, attack, misunderstanding and orrowful rebuke. That notable organ of Church opinion, the *hurch Times*, saw fit to build upon my words a majestic defence f the faith against attacks upon it from its enemies, the deadliest f which, it stated, is humanism.

> 'The hatred of the Creeds is but one of the many forms taken by human pride. It is typical of the man, more clever than wise, who is not humble enough to accept revelation.'

ut at the risk of pride, and with a real respect for the Creeds if ey are not misused — a respect as great, perhaps, or even reater than that of the writer of that leading article — I stand by hat I have said to these young people. For I believe it to be ontrary to the law of love, and opposed to any real freedom, to isuse the Creeds and to make them a barrier to the full exercise f the Christian way of life. Is this humanism? Then let us be umanists.

By their fruits ye know them, not by their assent to any set of ffirmations about the faith they profess. Not everyone that saith believe this, I believe that, shall enter into the kingdom of God,

but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. To build our faith upon acceptance of the Creeds is to build it upon sand.

Of course a man will behave in accordance with what he believes. 'Only a freedom rooted in faith is able to survive or deserves to survive': these words of William Temple will probably strike a chord of response in every honest heart. And every honest person will perhaps echo the words of the writer in the *Church Times* when he says, 'It is an illusion to suppose that a man's mind is free if it rejects all faith' and 'moral freedom is equally impossible without faith.' But to say all this, and to believe it, is not to agree that the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds are final statements of the Christian faith, nor, indeed, that the acceptance of any credal affirmation is evidence of the possession of that faith by which a man can say

> 'Jesus, my Lord, I Thee adore,
> Oh make me love Thee more and more.'

These Creeds have a long history. They were constructed during three centuries of struggle, often accompanied by unseemly brawls, struggle to work out in terms of the thought of the early Christian era statements concerning the faith which should safeguard it from misunderstanding. They represent attempts to incorporate the experience of Christians into static forms, intellectually conceived. Taken for what they are, they commend themselves as magnificent symbols of historical significance. They help to ensure the continuity of the life of the Church in terms of its original experience, and they bring down to our generation a weight of tradition which we shall ignore at our peril. So they are an important element in Christian worship and a guide for Christian instruction.

But to treat them as anything more is to destroy their effectiveness in the life of the Christian community. To allow them to become a test, a barrier, for the life of fellowship within the Church is, I believe, madness. For to make them such is to offend against the law of love, to destroy the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and to make a mockery of faith. I do not say that the Creeds should be revised, rewritten, to bring them into line with modern thought — to revise them would only result in our losing their true worth as guarantees of our remaining loyal to the Apostolic tradition, and in giving us the task of again revising them every few years. But I do say that no Creed, no intellectual affirmation, necessarily inadequate as it must be, often not understood, should be allowed to bar the way to anyone who loves our Lord from playing a part in the fellowship of the Church,

d from receiving from the Church those gifts which, we believe, rich us with the power of God's grace.

Any religion which includes an element of compulsion is a ligion built upon sand. But the Churches all too frequently rely on authority rather than upon freedom, and exert their influence, ch as it is, not through love but through temporal power. And misusing the Creeds, by making of them tests for orthodoxy and insisting upon their acceptance as a condition of entry into the llowship of the faithful, they destroy their proper usefulness, ake a mockery of the truths they were intended to safeguard, and nder the flow of God's love in the world.

> 'Truth nailed upon the Cross compels nobody, oppresses no one; it must be accepted and confessed freely. . . . A divine Truth panoplied in power, triumphant in the world and conquering souls, would not be consonant with the freedom of man's spirit, and so the mystery of Golgotha is the mystery of liberty. . . . Every time in history that man has tried to turn crucified Truth into coercive truth he has betrayed the fundamental principle of Christ.'

hese words of Berdyaev are a warning to us against building our lith upon the sand; they are an inspiration to us to build it upon ne other than the rock which is Christ.

I end with a simple illustration: the case of Mrs. Smith and rs. Jones. Mrs. Smith is bitter, self-centred, unloving. She hears e words of Jesus and does not do them. But whether through norance, fear or hypocrisy she affirms her acceptance of the reeds. She, though bearing no fruit of love, is baptized, conrmed, a communicant, a member of the Christian community. rs. Jones, on the other hand, hears the words of Jesus and tries do them. She is kindly, unselfish, loving. But she is also nest, she hates hypocrisy: and because, like thousands brought p in our modern world with an enquiring and a scientific mind, ie cannot say without explaining away its literal sense that she elieves in the resurrection of the body, or that Jesus was born of virgin and descended into hell, she is excluded from the hurch, not allowed to receive those gifts which, in her, would ear so much fruit of love.

Here surely is fundamental error, grave disservice to the purose of God. Dogma has become master, love the slave: freedom as been cast aside, truth muzzled, and the Holy Spirit put to ight.

CHRISTIANITY AND CITIZENSHIP*

By Sir Henry Self, K.C.B., B.D.

'Where there is no vision, the people perish.'
Proverbs, chapter xxix, verse 18

I. Rise of Religion

ON King Alfred's Day, in the parish where he was buried, it is indeed appropriate that the speaker should be invited to assess the status of citizenship as achieved in this country under the stimulus of Christianity. It is obviously essential for such a task to recall briefly the course of religious development which has resulted in this country, throughout its great history, finding itself in close and living association with a national Church—itself manifesting a unique tradition of spiritual growth.

The origins of religion are to be found, here as elsewhere, in tribal life as small groups of human beings strove to establish themselves in surroundings constituting a perpetual challenge to life and providing a continual spur to the development of the innate faculties of man. Throughout this phase of tribal development the prior emphasis was on the tribe, and the individual found very little status as such. Nevertheless, even during these early periods of religious growth the over-riding welfare and destiny of the tribe did not prevent the few gifted individuals of genius from coming forward as guides and leaders of their peoples and proclaiming new visions of human status, responsibility and destiny.

It was largely through the activities of these few leaders as mankind emerged from the background of primitive life that we find the first grouping together of clans and tribes into wider societies such as we now call 'nations.' Eventually the hallmark of true development is seen to have turned on the emergence of a national religion which could provide a spiritual focus for the merging of the many groups into one people, after much warfare between the clans and the overcoming of local jealousies and petty aspirations. Moreover, it is only within the setting of such a national religion that there first emerges the fuller possibility of the growth of the individual towards a recognized status within society, and a sense of direct and personal religious experience.

In England this upward movement of human society came to a special focus in King Alfred. But wherever such progress has been achieved, we see the dawning of personal religion as the expression of individual life at its best within the setting of an

* Address given at Winchester on October 26, 1951, on King Alfred's Day.

rdered community. Freedom becomes the hallmark of personal evelopment, but always it has to be a freedom within the legiti- ate restrictions imposed by communal order. The process is niquely exemplified in the writings of the Hebrew prophets, mos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and culminating in Jeremiah. The rly writers were concerned with the holiness of God and the atus of His people : it was only later that we see the progressive nergence of the individual sense of personal relationship to God. his conviction was the supreme contribution of Jeremiah — a uly great prophet, despite the mistaken but popular misconcep- on of him; he was, in fact, the first great prophet in the history f Israel to realize that the individual has a personal destiny, to e pursued through spiritual and direct relationship to God, as e background of life.

This stage is all-important for understanding of the relation- ip between religion and citizenship. It was only when religion ad fostered the merging of warring groups into an ordered com- unity, and had at the same time brought to a first expression the ersonal status of the individual, that there was any real possi- lity of a rightly ordered society. This must provide legitimate ope and initiative for the individual, who nevertheless finds his wn soul in the service of his people under the inspiration of ligious experience as the basic *motif* of his existence. Here we ave the dawning of that true development of national life which as only realizable under the Christian revelation, and which is -day itself seeking fuller realization in an international order for hich the future at the moment seems so uncertain. Have we the ght to believe that this international order will go forward to a ue development of peaceful achievement, or is it only to be ought so far for it to fall into the throes of self-destruction? he answer must depend on the extent to which the individual ations succeed in first reconciling their national lives and aspira- ons with the legitimate status of their individual citizens. Then will be found possible to apply also on the international plane e basic principles prescribed by Christian precept and practice r true citizenship within an ordered society.

II. The Nature of Religion

It will be obvious from this introduction that religion itself is e co-ordinating feature of all human existence. It, in fact, xpresses man's relationship to the universe in which he lives. he word 'religion' itself implies this : it refers to the bonds prehended between the individual and the background that he stulates intuitively behind the physical world in which he finds

himself. It follows that religion does not necessarily mean something high and good. It is only when religion itself has been focused upon the highest thoughts that man can achieve in response to Divine Revelation that it becomes a living and inspiring influence in the individual or national life.

Here it is perfectly clear that religion and citizenship are interlocked and can never really be separated. Man at his best expresses his ideals from two standpoints: first, in relation to the Supreme Being whom he calls God as the focus of the spiritual world which he presumes to be behind and controlling the physical universe; secondly, in relation to his conception of the society, the ideal society, to which he belongs. Come what may, he will hold firm to these ideals and pursue them as the line of destiny both for himself and the nation he serves. This was uniquely exemplified in King Alfred.

III. King Alfred's Part

It would be impertinent for me here in Winchester, in the place of King Alfred's burial, to attempt to outline the manner in which he contributed to the triumph of Christianity and the realization of true citizenship in this land of England, but I must, however inadequately, draw your attention to the manner in which he himself saw beyond the conflicting aspirations of the petty kingdoms and competing races and played so great a part in bringing about the transition to an ordered community with a developing conception (*a*) of Christianity as the national religion and (*b*) of the individual as a citizen with a personal status *plus* responsibilities. He was, in fact, the man of vision who more than anybody in our national history typifies my text: 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' His vision was truly great and the people were saved. Through him national and individual relationships and activities found a new focus of development and reconciliation.

You have, no doubt, often heard of the manner in which the last four years of his life were devoted very largely to writings of his own and translations of outstanding works for the guidance and training, both of the clergy and through them of the people, such as Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* and Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, a book which at that time was one great source of Christian inspiration. Recognizing himself that personal endeavour and service should be the keynote of life, he sought to inspire and guide his people to the right understanding of the Christian way of life and their high destiny—both individually and as a nation. In his own contribution to the

translation of Boethius there is that well-known passage: 'My will was to live worthily as long as I live, and after my life to leave to them that should come after, my memory in good works.'

IV. Citizenship and Christianity

It was through Alfred that a new revelation was introduced through the English people into the world. The Christian sees in the history of Israel the historical background which prepared the way for the emergence of Christianity as the supreme revelation. Equally, it was through Alfred that the English people in their turn started upon that long era of outstanding and characteristic national history which has meant so much for the whole human race; I refer to the great English tradition of the right relationship between the individual and society. In this land the status of citizenship and the form of society have been the concepts of progressive development in such a manner as to constitute a new and all-inspiring revelation to world order and to individual existence.

But may I remind you that this revelation is founded pre-eminently on the Christian faith and was only made manifest by a unique relationship between the national Church and the State? It was based on three principles: first, the principle of service through endeavour on behalf of the community as the way of true self-development; secondly, the realization that the road of achievement is 'the hard road, the hard way'; and thirdly, the duty of self-expression.

The first I have already touched upon. As for the second, recent experiences must have taught us all that life is no easy path of roses. It is hard because it is a place of training and growth. Nobody achieved anything worthwhile without difficulty and no growth is possible except it be against opposition. Moreover, if life has any meaning, it must be a stage of preparation for something greater to follow — and no graduation is worthwhile unless it represents real effort. 'Easy come, easy go.' The Christian Revelation is stern in its call but equally firm in its assurance of the strength to achieve, despite repeated failures.

The third duty of self-expression is as true of the nation as of the individual. England has, indeed, nobly fulfilled its task of realizing and manifesting its unique national character as an inspiring contribution to world development. It is not perhaps realized quite so generally how serious is the responsibility of the individual in this respect. Each human being has a uniqueness of character which ought to be brought to self-expression whether it be by head, hands or feet — whether by thought, learning, artistic

endeavour, craftsmanship or other forms of willing service. The national life and the individual destiny need the fullest self-expression by each and every citizen. All can pursue in varying degree the roads of Truth, Beauty and Goodness as the paths of self-expression. Education, contributing to the development of character, should continue till the fitful span of life here is spun.

V. The Catechism

To my mind, the Christian doctrine is summarized in the passage from the Catechism which reminds us that a Christian is first, 'a member of Christ'; secondly, 'a child of God'; and thirdly, 'an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

Christ — the Eternal Christ — is the Focus of Spiritual Humanity. The individual is a member of this Christian society, surrendering himself in service to find himself anew within his spiritual relationships. Community and individual are reciprocal terms, each implying and supporting the other. Here is the perfect focus for the true relations between the State and its citizens. The community should promote the welfare and enterprise of its members—but let the individual not forget his responsibilities towards the community. 'Welfare' connotes 'Duty'—and a typical act of duty, which might well be recalled to-day, is to give an honest day's work for a proper day's pay.

The title 'Child of God' is a warm tribute to the status and destiny of the individual, but it serves also to reinforce the sense of responsibility. It brings to a very clear focus the Christian view of human destiny which is so vital to-day when melancholy, apathy and uncertainty are so rampant concerning the prospects of human development during an epoch when the achievements of a scientific materialism are being applied to such menacing ends because man's spiritual growth has so grievously lagged behind his utilitarianism.

Do we really believe in our future as 'inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven'? If so, where is the room for pessimism? We do not expect to reap the inheritance here in this brief span of life: the prospect is of limitless growth as we shall hereafter explore the vastness and untold potentialities of God's Universe — spiritual as well as physical. But the prospects will depend on the preparation achieved here: how can the Christian citizen afford to ignore the admonition of King Alfred:

> 'Therefore he seems to be a very foolish man, and very wretched, who will not increase his understanding while he is in the world, and ever wish and long to reach that endless life where all shall be made clear.'

VI. The Sense of Destiny

This seems to me to be that which the human race is so grievously missing to-day — a proper sense of destiny. It is given in such simple form in the Christian message — a form which would, if accepted by all, ensure its own realization and the future of the world.

The human race is destined to be the spiritual humanity for the creation of which the universe has been groaning in travail for so long. The individual sees his own destiny in the Eternal Christ as a member of that community — giving himself to find himself and seeking the joyous road of 'adventure in faith' — hard but supremely worthwhile. The universe itself will then, indeed, find its true setting as the Garment of the Living God—rich in beauty and wonder, a fitting home for His family.

VII. The Status of the Church

In all this the Church, and particularly our national Church, has an essential part to play. In her must be found the source of true Vision, the perpetual challenge to falterings or wanderings or perversions from the true line of spiritual growth whether on the national or the individual plane. Finally, in her must be for ever preserved the Shrine of the inner personal life and the religious gropings of the nation and its citizens — embodying a unique spiritual tradition, re-presenting it ever fresh for each generation to re-live and ministering to all who seek communion with God through her guidance and inspiration. How great is the glory of her past! How great will be her future!

The words of my text might well be the motto for the English Church by whom it has so well been honoured. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' Vision relates to the future: it is inspired by the past and attendant to the present, but all its emphasis is on the path ahead.

Vision is the crying need to-day. The Church enshrines the great tradition of Faith as it has sustained a unique people through many centuries: it expresses supremely all the national aspirations and pent-up feelings with unfailing certainty of touch, especially at times of crisis. Given the prophetic vision, what could it not achieve in the battle for the Future — first for this people and then, through them, for the world?

RELIGION AND THE IRISH PROBLEM

THE jingle attributed to Daniel O'Connell which claimed on behalf of Irish Roman Catholics that, though they had had their religion from Rome, they got their politics at home, was no doubt intended to soothe the minds of the Anglo-Irish population and of the British Members of Parliament who regarded repeal of the Parliamentary union with Great Britain as being (among other things) a menace to the liberties of the Irish minority. Religion, O'Connell seemed to suggest, was mainly a personal concern, something which brought individuals into relations to the Church not unlike the relations of patients to their medical advisers — something quite unlike politics, which brought under definite rules the relations of the individual to society and of society to the individual. And, if the religion of the Irish majority had been derived directly from Palestine, O'Connell's words might have had the soothing effect desired; Repeal might have been considered dispassionately, and a Home Rule Bill might have been passed while C. S. Parnell was still at Cambridge.

The derivation of religion from Rome made an immense difference. The 'faith once for all delivered to the saints' had been reduced to a set of propositions by Greek and other theologians, and inquiry had been discouraged by the Roman hierarchy, which was largely an administrative body. The 'deposit of faith' was kept wrapped in a napkin, and it did not improve by keeping. The Romans were probably the least speculative, the least philosophic, of Europe's greater races. They were positivists who had not been interested enough to rid their minds of primeval superstitions. The early converts to Christianity no doubt rose above racial limitations, but by the time that the Church had made terms with the State, Roman Christianity had become tainted by its pagan surroundings. Whatever truth remained in it was not strong enough to make its adherents free. The Dark Ages followed, and in the darkness freedom would hardly have been an asset.

I do not know whether the popular idea of the awakening known as the Reformation is due to accounts by unimaginative authors of school histories. Most of these accounts suffer from a kind of meiosis. *Nil admirari* seems to have been the motto of the writers. They give readers no notion of the joy with which the best minds of the northern countries welcomed the new presentation of Christianity and the recovery of Christianity's long-neglected source-book. Letters and other writings of Erasmus,

William Tyndale, Dean Colet, Roger Ascham, and others express feelings that remind one of young Wordsworth's in that dawn in which he deemed it bliss to be alive. The Reformation dawn, like the French, was soon clouded. When Elizabeth became queen the breach with Rome had become irreparable, but till the year 1588, when the defeat of the Armada made England safe from the most dreaded of her enemies, religious freedom was almost continuously threatened. In Scotland, for centuries a 'natural enemy,' it was doubtful whether the Reformers would be able to save themselves and their neighbours from the effects of the ambition and religious zeal of their queen; and from across the Channel France might have taken a hand in reducing the rebel kingdom to subjection, if fear and jealousy of Spain had not forced her to confine crusading to her own borders. On England's western flank a great part of Ireland was open to the emissaries of Rome and soon became a menace to the English districts. The cities of Ireland and the larger towns were English. They had never been Gaelic. Most of them had been founded by the Norse, and had been occupied by them till the Normans arrived in the twelfth century. Ulster, which politicians in Eire claim as an integral part of Ireland, seems to have been, in the early centuries, virtually independent (though the Normans, as the Vikings years before them, got something more than a footing there). Far in the West, and reached no doubt as often by sea as by land, was an English outpost, Galway, a small city which for some centuries had withstood sporadic attacks by the 'ferocious O'Flaherties' and other marauders. In the sixteenth and following centuries the city's isolation gave its Protestantism, such as it was, little chance of holding its own against the Counter-Reformation; indeed, according to Lecky, it became 'the favourite landing-place of Popish ecclesiastics from the Continent.'

The change of religious allegiance in England was naturally followed by a similar change in Ireland. But, though the Irish Church became officially Reformed, Protestantism must have been for a long time confined to the cities and towns, and in these to the ruling classes. Most of the descendants of the English settlers in the rural areas remained Romanists, and were the more ready to remain Romanists the farther they lived from the centres of population. For the first time the clans united against the people of the Pale. They made common cause, and the cause, unfortunately, was religion. On the English side religion no doubt sharpened the colonists' opposition. Both sides were sure that they were right. The Gaels and rural English, being Romanists, had never had any doubts; the Protestants were probably equally cer-

tain. One party believed that its church was infallible; the other believed in the infallibility of its sacred book. In such conditions a war might easily become one of extermination, and, for long enough, extermination seems to have been the aim of each side. On the Catholic side a holy war was waged with the goodwill of the Pope, who at the same time was trying through his Jesuit agents to undermine the Protestantism of England. At home and in Ireland, England was fighting for hard-won liberty — for life itself—and the alliance of Romanist Ireland with Spain must have filled English hearts with the hate that accompanies fear.

Had Philip of Spain been able to send such an army into Ireland as he was ready to send into England in 1588, Anglo-Ireland would probably have disappeared and the western coasts of England would have been exposed to greater danger than the southern coasts were exposed to when the Armada was sailing up the Channel. Vigorous and utterly ruthless action averted the danger. The Desmond rebellion failed, and the scorched-earth policy of the victors added to difficulties of co-operation when, a few years later, the northern clans came to the help of the Spaniards occupying Kinsale.

Holy wars, attempts to rid Ireland of heretics by force, were ruinous to those who made them. The heretics were not turned out of the country,, and those who tried to turn them out paid dearly for their folly and cruelty. The massacres that accompanied the 1641 rising were not forgotten by Cromwell, and when Catholic Ireland under Tyrconnell failed to thwart England's rejection of James the Second and choice of his Dutch son-in-law, the Penal Laws were enacted, and the Protestant Ascendancy, their direct consequence, divided the population into privileged and unprivileged till the year 1869, when the Church of Ireland was reduced to the political position of the country's other religious bodies. It is to be remembered, however, that, three-quarters of a century earlier, the worst features of Ascendancy had disappeared. In 1793 the second Relief Bill 'enabled the Catholics to bear arms, to become members of corporations, to vote as forty-shilling freeholders in the counties and in the open boroughs, to act as grand jurors, to take degrees in Dublin University, to hold minor offices, and to take commissions in the army below the rank of colonel' (Edmund Curtis, *History of Ireland*, 1st ed., p. 332). In 1829 Roman Catholics were admitted to Parliament, after which the only positions closed to them were the Throne, the Viceroyalty, and the Chancellorship.

When I was a boy, Irish Nationalists used at times to talk sentimentally about the Old House, the building (now the Bank

f Ireland) which faces Dublin University, and which was the ıeeting-place of Parliament in the last years of the eighteenth entury. But when the Treaty of 1921 made Southern Ireland a ominion, no one seems to have suggested the Old House as a ıeeting-place for the Dominion Parliament. The reconditioning f the building might have been too costly, but the chief reason or ignoring it, I think, was the fact that the party that came into ower in 1921 had no sentimental hankering after the home of rattan's Parliament, an Anglo-Irish assembly and Protestant to oot. Sinn Fein, the new party, looked back beyond the period of scendancy to 'the ancient Irish nation' which Mr. de Valera has ıore than once referred to. He must have used the word *nation* ı as Pickwickian a sense as the word *democracy* is used by Mr. talin. There was an ancient Gaelic *people* in Ireland, but clan yalty did not make for nationhood. Reason had little to do with ; authority was almost everything. To the present day, though ıe clans have long since disappeared, the clan spirit—the *führer rinzip* — remains. It is the spirit of Sinn Fein, 'Irish-Ireland,' ot Ireland, being the object of the majority's present-day evotion.

Clan loyalty produced unsatisfactory results in the Scottish ighlands and Isles, but antidotes were found in the Reformaon and in representative government. In Ireland, for nearly a ndred years, one of these antidotes was tried, and I have no ubt that the experience of the Irish Members of Parliament at estminster was (potentially) of inestimable value to their untry. If the country had also had the luck to try the other ıtidote, the sense of individuality might have checked excesses the herd instinct, and Parliamentary government in Eire might ve been really democratic. The country, moreover, might have caped its present position of political insignificance. As citizens a dominion Eire's representatives would have counted in interıtional affairs; as citizens of a republic they have no standing tside the twenty-six counties; and neither there nor anywhere se has Eire the authority that comes from straight dealing. By nn Fein's treatment of the Anglo-Irish, the most reliable of her tizens, she has confirmed Northern Ireland's deep-rooted disıst of Southern Ireland's politicians (which their actions in the riod between the retirement of Mr. W. T. Cosgrave and Eire's cession from the Commonwealth did nothing to lessen), and in is and other ways has made permanent the political division of e island. The republic's claim to include Northern Ireland is childish as King James the First's claim to include France in s realm.

While Eire was a dominion, 'Up the Republic!' was a popular cry among the members of one of the Sinn Fein parties, but no one took the trouble to tell us why the Republic should be up, or what advantages the country was to expect if the Republic were up. What natural interest, in any case, could Roman Catholics have in a republic? Irish republicanism derives mainly (by way of America) from Oliver Cromwell and the Puritans. Republics are for Protestants, not for Romanists; they are for men and women whose minds are not distracted by allegiance to a power which differs fundamentally from all republics, uncrowned or crowned.

The mind of man, however, is wonderfully adaptable, and so, among Irish Roman Catholics, one found many whose loyalty to the British crowned republic was as genuine as their loyalty to the Pope. They belonged, most of them, to the well-to-do classes, descendants no doubt of Catholics who had the courage or the luck to take advantage of the Relief Act of 1793. Considered in relation to recent events, their action (even if snobbishness in some cases had been among its motives) seems to have been in the right direction. In another country it would have made for unity and the building of a nation. What they did was what the Highland Jacobites had the sense to do after the Forty-Five. If they had been supported by the mass of the Irish people, Eire might have become conterminous with Ireland. Ignorance was the chief obstacle. The mass of the people had to wait till 1831 for the establishment of a system of national education (due largely to the thought and perseverance of the Irish Catholic, Sir Thomas Wyse), and, for higher education, till 1849, when the Queen's Colleges were opened. These catered for the section of the middle class below that of the rich, and for this section in all parts of the country. The 'Ulster Scots' had a college in Belfast (the nucleus of the present Queen's University); the 'Irish-Irish' had one in Galway, and the people south of the Galtees had a college in Cork. According to Professor Auchmuty (*Irish Education*, p. 116), 'The great majority of the Irish people were enthusiastic when they heard of the Government's proposal' to establish colleges, and the Bill had the support of the Roman Catholic Primate, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Cork, and other ecclesiastics. But the hierarchy was divided, and when, a few years later, a university was established for the incorporation of the Queen's Colleges, a rescript from Rome condemned the university as Godless, and the colleges as dangerous to faith and morals. In 1854 a 'Catholic University' was founded by the bishops, and J. H. Newman was induced to leave England to be its first president

existence probably did something to keep down the number of man Catholic students in the Queen's Colleges and in Dublin niversity, but its own student roll was never as full as its nders had looked for, and it must have been a welcome relief en the Royal University was founded and admitted scholars of Catholic University to its fellowship.

The Royal University, which was founded in 1882, was merely examining institution entitled to confer degrees, and was there- e much inferior in most respects to its neighbour Dublin Uni- sity, commonly called Trinity College. It lasted till 1908, en the National University was founded. From its first years National has been successful. It has had the approval of the man Church, and strong support from the Catholic laity. Its nstitution is non-sectarian, but the academic atmosphere is at st as Papal as Trinity College's atmosphere is Protestant. It uld satisfy the Roman Church's desire for denominational edu- ion if it could make the bishops' ban on Trinity unnecessary, t, as far as I know, Trinity attracts as many Catholic students ever. These students do not lose their faith, and I have never ard that their morals suffered. Their going to Trinity is against declared wishes of the Catholic hierarchy, but they are socially important to be openly opposed.

Looking back on my country's unhappy record, I seem to find chief hindrances to cohesion, either of them serious enough to ke nation-building well-nigh impossible. These are the clan rit and religious exclusiveness. The clan spirit, strengthened not produced by the country's physical features, left the island the early centuries an easy prey to invaders; and the conse- ent loss of ports must have tended to cramp the Gaelic intelli- nce. There was plenty of intelligence in the country, but there s nothing big enough on which to exercise it. Minds lay fallow. e great discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ich set the minds of Western Europe ranging do not seem to ve affected the Gaels. The Reformation was to them merely the ntonness of unpleasant neighbours, and Rome had no difficulty retaining the allegiance of the country folk. Religious segrega- n soon did for Ireland the ill service that had been done by clan clusiveness. When 'national education' was introduced a couple centuries later, ecclesiastical influence—not all of it Roman— t Catholics and Protestants apart. Sir Thomas Wyse on the hand and Archbishop Whately on the other advocated nmon schooling in secular subjects for Catholic and Protestant ldren, but fears and suspicions in both camps defeated their rts, and denominationalism became characteristic of Irish

primary education. Secondary education had been always denominational. The establishment of the National University seemed to make the educational segregation of Catholics and Protestants complete and final. Segregation, however, is not complete while Protestants and Catholics work and play together in T.C.D., and who can say that it will characterize Irish education a hundred years hence?

> The star of the West shall yet rise in its glory,
> And the land that was darkest be brightest in story,
> When Erin awakes and her fetters are broken.

Whenever that happens, I hope that the chains will fall off quietly as they are said to have fallen off St. Peter in the prison at the voice of the angel. They will fall very quietly if the angelic voice is obeyed first of all in the National University.

H. R. CHILLINGWORTH

A LAYMAN'S READING

By JOHN ROWLAND, B.Sc.

NOW and then there appears a book which, though it may be unpretentious in appearance and price, seems likely to make some genuine impact on the thought of its time. I am not at all sure that a book which I have just read should not be considered as coming within this category. This is *Vacant Possession* by G. L. Heawood (S.C.M. Press; 8*s.* 6*d.*). Mr. Heawood is the Headmaster of Cheltenham Grammar School, and he has faced boldly and without equivocation the difficulties of a truly Christian schoolmaster in our day dealing with children who come from every possible kind of religious background. 'Are we,' he asks, 'expected to teach *about* Christianity, or to teach them Christianity?' And his book is not merely a book for teachers alone though teachers are, naturally, those to whom it will make its most immediate appeal. Mr. Heawood muses on many problems of religion and philosophy; he admits readily enough that the language of the Thirty-nine Articles and even of the creeds of the Church have become so stabilized, while the meaning of those words in everyday speech has altered, that fewer and fewer people are able to accept the statements in their original form.

To turn from Mr. Heawood to Professor Schrödinger is not to make such a big jump as would be thought. Professor Schrödinger has written, in *Science and Humanism* (Cambridge University Press; 8*s.* 6*d.*), a book which is short and so compressed as to be

no means easy reading. But at the same time (especially in its lier pages, where he discusses the value and function of scien- research) he has written a volume which cannot be neglected anyone wishing to understand what has been going on in these few difficult years in the sphere of theoretical physics.

Far more massive is the work of Dr. Erich Sauer. Typically man in its detail and its cumulative building of the evidence, statement of a case for the more traditional attitude to Chris- ity occupies two interesting volumes, *The Dawn of World demption* and *The Triumph of the Crucified* (Paternoster ss, 10*s.* 6*d.* each volume). Dr. Sauer is Director of the Bible ool of Wiedenest, Germany, and in these two books he has ered the history and development of the idea of redemption in Old and the New Testaments. There are moments when the dern reader may feel a little disconcerted at the extreme alist views of the author; but the broad sweep of his narrative the way in which he has utilized his extremely detailed know- ge of the Bible are impressive. To a reader who is not an ert theologian, at any rate, these two volumes appear valuable remarkably closely argued.

As a contrast, perhaps, the thoughtful reader may well pro- ss to Dr. Alfred Hall's well-edited *James Martineau: Selec- s* (Lindsey Press; 7*s.* 6*d.*), which brings back into view a once- ular but long-neglected thinker. Martineau was quite certainly of the most striking of the less orthodox theologians of the Victoria era, and in such remarks as 'What Science calls the ormity of Nature, Faith accepts as the fidelity of God' he vides his present-day reader with real food for meditation and ght.

The Autobiography of Robert A. Millikan (Macdonald; 21*s.*) nother very much worth-while book. Dr. Millikan is, of rse, the great expert on cosmic rays, that mysterious form of ation which comes to the earth from outer space. He is now nty-four years of age, but is still as keenly alive to the climate modern thought as he ever was in his youth. And — this is haps what is most striking of all to those who are interested in interactions between science and theology — he states that, in opinion,

> 'religion and science are the two great sister forces which have pulled and are still pulling mankind onward and upward.'

ong ago as 1923 he signed a joint statement (published as an endix to his book), issued by many of the more prominent ntists, Protestant leaders, and men of affairs in the U.S.A., dealing with this matter of science and religion. This state-

ment, he says, was intended to correct two erroneous conceptions current in the twentieth century. The two conceptions are:

> 'That religion to-day stands for medieval theology; and that science is materialistic and irreligious.'

The book is not, naturally, a mere treatise on the theological implications of science; it is an interesting and in places amusing life-story; but at the same time its theological aspects are of very real value and importance.

Scientists seem to occupy a lot of our time in these days; but the poets cannot be neglected. And here are two books which deserve a mention. Mr. Jack R. Clemo has already made a certain name for himself as novelist and autobiographer; I recommended his *Confession of a Rebel* here months ago. But *The Clay Verge* (Chatto & Windus; 4*s*. 6*d*.) is his first book of verse. Like everything else he writes, his poetry reflects the background against which he has lived all his life up to now — the china-clay country around St. Austell in Cornwall. But at the same time the poems reflect a struggle to form a reasonable and a satisfying religious faith. They are, indeed, essays in religion and the way in which it may be applied to everyday life. Mr. Clemo also contributes to the second volume of verse which I have to recommend at the moment — *Poems: 1951* (Penguin Books; 2*s*. 6*d*.). Readers who are interested in modern poetry will be aware that the Arts Council gave a group of prizes for the best poems submitted in connection with the Festival of Britain last year, and this book contains the eight which were selected (out of more than two thousand!) as worthy of prizes. Mr. Clemo's contribution (a group of poems entitled 'The Wintry Priesthood') shows a greater certainty, both of poetic technique and of religious feeling, than his own volume which appeared earlier. And there is also an interesting group of verses by Mr. Clive Sansom, entitled 'The Witnesses: A Composite Portrait,' which consists of a series of descriptions of Jesus imagined as being seen by various contemporary witnesses. But that two, at least, out of the eight prize-winners in this competition should be genuinely religious poets seems to me to be a striking phenomenon which cannot pass unnoticed in the supposedly irreligious era through which we are passing.

As an example of the value of a religious outlook to the world I may, perhaps, also mention a book published some time ago but recently reissued in a revised edition. This is Mr. Magnus Ratter's *Albert Schweitzer: A Biography* (Lindsey Press; 8*s*. 6*d*.). Actually, the title is in some respects misleading. About one-third of the book is concerned with a direct biographical description of the life of Dr. Schweitzer; the remainder of the volume is occu-

ed with a detailed and interesting account of his attitude of nd, special attention being paid to his theological ideas. Mr. atter is an ideal interpreter of the mind and work of one of the eatest men of our time.

More dubious, but still readable, is Mr. Hugh Ross William-n's *The Gunpowder Plot* (Faber; 21*s.*). This volume has been irly widely attacked in the Press as giving a very one-sided view the events which caused such a stir three hundred and fifty years o. Indeed, Mr. Williamson gives what is in effect the Roman tholic case for the Plot. He holds that it was what would now called a 'frame-up,' in that the authorities knew well what was ppening and that they allowed it to go forward in order that ey should have an excuse for penalising the Roman Catholics r trying to overthrow the Protestant monarchy. Many readers ll, I think, feel that the case is not made out with anything proaching complete certainty; but at the same time, as a picture an exciting period of English history, the book cannot be glected.

To leave this argumentative ground for a moment, and to turn the more realistic approach of the modern scientist, a book to appreciated by all who wish to understand what science is doing our day is *Aspects of Modern Science*, edited by Ivo Geikie-obb (Sampson Low; 21*s.*). Here experts in the various sciences ve accounts of what has been going on in their special spheres iring recent years. Sir David Brunt, for example, writes on eteorology, Professor L. P. Garrod on bacteriology, and Sir exander Fleming on chemotherapy—the last-named being per-ps the most striking contribution of all.

Back on ground which, in parts, is more controversial, I must ve a few lines at least to Canon Lindsay Dewar's *The Moral nduct of a Christian* (Mowbrays; 7*s.* 6*d.*). There are many who ll not always agree with the emphasis of the book, though the ct that Canon Dewar, Principal of Bishop's College, Cheshunt, aiming to provide some guide to Christian ethics for those who, our day, stand aside from the fellowship of any of the Christian nurches, will give his book value, even for those who do not ogether share his theological attitude. With this may be read other book from the same publishers, price 3*s.* 6*d.* This is *The itish Tradition*, which contains a series of broadcast talks given the Home Service during May and June last. The contributors clude Canon Charles Smyth of Westminster; the Rev. Lovell cks, Principal of the Western College, Bristol; Sir John Maud, ermanent Secretary to the Ministry of Education; and Dr. ngmead Casserley, Lecturer in Sociology at University Col-

lege, Exeter. The book sets out to show (and, I think, on the whole establishes its case) that the best in English life has a Christian foundation. It suggests, too, that many of our people are, in a sense, living on their religious capital, with the result that something like spiritual bankruptcy may be the eventual result. A timely book, and a book which should have a wide public, especially since it is issued at such an eminently reasonable price.

In each of my articles here I have endeavoured to mention one or two books which (without being too flippant or superficial) are of some recreation value. This time there are three which come within this class. The first is a book of short stories by a new author who, if I am not mistaken, will make his mark in the world of imaginative literature before many years are gone. I refer to Mr. Charles Causley, whose *Hands to Dance* (Carroll & Nicholson; 10*s.* 6*d.*) seems to me to be one of the most promising first books to appear for many a long day. What remains to be seen is whether Mr. Causley can stay the pace in the longer form of the novel. Personally, I think he can. My second recreational book is for music lovers. Mr. Sidney Harrison is well-known as a player and as an interpreter of music, and his *You Shall Have Music* (Watts; 1*s.*) is a really first-rate introduction to serious music for readers who wish to listen to symphony concerts with intelligent interest. The third book in this recreational class is *Bernard Spilsbury: His Life and Work*, by Douglas G. Browne and E. V. Tullett (Harrap; 21*s.*). Sir Bernard Spilsbury was one of the most publicised men of our day, whose name appeared in the Press on almost every occasion when a criminal case was being tried. But he was a shy and retiring man, whose life remained a closed book to his many admirers among the general public. Mr. Browne and Mr. Tullett have had the assistance of his family, and have produced a biography which is of great interest to all who have any knowledge of criminal law.

Finally, as a kind of footnote, I may perhaps mention *The Christian Mission*, by Max Warren, General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society (S.C.M. Press; 7*s.* 6*d.*). This is a neat and forthright defence of the work of missionaries and an answer to those critics of missionary endeavour who say, 'Why interfere with the religious beliefs of other peoples?' Mr. Warren knows his subject inside-out, as we say. Indeed, in view of his official position he is bound to know more than most people about this topic. His final chapter, 'The Hope of the Mission,' provides an inspiring picture of what may yet be done in improving the lot of the native populations in Africa especially. And so the book ties on neatly to the work on Albert Schweitzer.

BOOK REVIEWS

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

There has been in recent years, among New Testament scholars, a signifi-
it return to some of the positions held, a hundred years ago, by the
bingen School. It is clearly illustrated by Prof. Schoeps's *Theologie und*
schichte des Judenchristentums, which emphasizes the significance and
portance of Judaic Christianity in the early Church. Dr. Brandon's
ok [1] brings, quite avowedly, another instance of the same tendency :

> 'The general criticism is anticipated that here many of the old ghosts of Tübingen have been recalled and allowed to stalk free through the discussion. If such an objection be made, the answer must surely be that those ghosts were never really laid and that they are found to be very substantial beings' (p. x).

e author stresses the tentative character of the interpretation which he
omits to other scholars, 'abiding their fair consideration.' He certainly
serves the closest attention of all those interested and competent in this
d of study. Even if they feel, as must be expected, unable to accept every
nclusion of the book, they cannot but acknowledge its great importance :
prings us, undoubtedly, a considerable step further in the understanding of
ristian origins.

The title and sub-title do not reveal the full scope and richness of the
ok. For, while bringing indeed, chiefly in its second half (chapters 8–12),
penetrating 'study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of A.D. 70 on
ristianity,' it is also much more than that. The first half gives a detailed
alysis of the situation of Christianity previous to the catastrophe. The
ok could thus adequately be described as a history of the Apostolic Age
m the point of view of the relations between the rising Church and Israel.

If we consider the New Testament documents with critical eyes, we
come aware, thinks Dr. Brandon, of a deep opposition between Paul and
first disciples, *i.e.* between their respective conceptions of Christianity.
e also realize that there was 'a period during which Paul's reputation
fered such an eclipse that his writings were neglected and their preserva-
n left to the chance of circumstance' (p. 9), and that, at the same time,
position of the Jerusalem Church was one of unchallenged leadership.
ul's subsequent rehabilitation, as expressed in the formation of the *Corpus*
linum, goes parallel with the passing away into complete oblivion of the
ther Church, as illustrated by the absence, in the New Testament, of any
ely authentic writing of her leaders. Meanwhile, a considerable change
s taken place in the very presentation of the Christian faith, as we pass
r from the Pauline epistles, which display but very little interest for the
torical Jesus, to the Gospels, with their essential emphasis on historical
a. These two successive stages are separated by a period of some ten to
nty years, from about A.D. 60, *i.e.* from the end of Paul's apostolate, to
writing down of the Gospels, which Dr. Brandon describes as a 'tunnel
iod,' on and from which we have no reliable information. As the fall of
usalem, on which, curiously enough, the Christian documents are almost
npletely silent, is the most outstanding event within that period, the con-
sion lies at hand that it had a decisive effect upon the development of
ly Christianity. We must, consequently, in order to understand this
elopment, try and throw some light into the tunnel.

[1] *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church — A Study of the Effects of the Jewish rthrow of* A.D. 70 *on Christianity*, by S. G. F. Brandon (S.P.C.K., London, 1951; pp. and 248; 30/-).

Having thus put the problem, Dr. Brandon then deals with the situation and character of the Primitive Church, according to the evidence of the Pauline Epistles and of *Acts*. He finds these sources to be in substantial agreement with each other on a number of important facts : the unique status of the Jerusalem Church and the primacy of James, the Lord's brother ; the definitely Jewish culture of the Jerusalem disciples, their zeal for Judaism and profound devotion to the Temple ; their great reluctance even to admit the right of the Gentiles to enter the Church. All this is remarkably worked out and sounds very convincing, except perhaps on a few points of minor importance (I personally think that Goguel is right in admitting that the primacy of James, and the instauration of a ' dynastic ' type of Christianity, is a consequence of Peter's leaving Jerusalem, and that Peter, not James, was the original head of the local Church).

The careful analysis of these features sheds new light on the opposition between Paul's interpretation of Christianity, of which Dr. Brandon gives a masterly *résumé*, and Christianity according to the Church of Jerusalem. One of the main causes of conflict between Paul and the Jewish Christians lies, according to the author, in their divergent and irreconcilable interpretations of the Crucifixion. Whereas Paul finds in it a positive soteriological meaning and consequently gives it the central place in his preaching, to the Jerusalemites it remains a puzzling problem, and even ' the soteriological possibilities of the idea of a suffering Messiah remained unexplored ' (p. 77). Although we know but little of the Jewish Christian Christology, we can at least assert that it was widely divergent from Paul's. Its possibilities of development were hampered by the essential fact of Jewish monotheism, to which the Pauline Christology, tending to a deification of Jesus, could not but appear as a mere scandal. (But is it really possible to recognize in the christological passage in *Philippians* ii, 5-11, a quotation from a *Judæo-Christian* hymn, as suggested on p. 82? It might well be a quotation indeed, but how could Paul have been led to quote from the liturgy of his rivals? I should rather see in this passage, which, to me at least, sounds very Pauline, an attempt of the Pauline congregations to answer, more or less satisfactorily, the accusation uttered against them of being no longer monotheistic.)

A careful analysis of the conflict between these two conceptions of Christianity, as seen through Paul's letters, leads Dr. Brandon to think that the steady efforts of the Jewish Christians, led by James and Peter, succeeded, throughout the churches of that time, in weighing down the balance more and more on their side. As long as Paul was there he was able, to a certain extent, to resist the movement. But after his arrest, captivity and death his communities were left helpless. The ' tunnel period ' of A.D. 55-70 is, in fact, the period when the Jewish Christian victory was confirmed. And the Christian Church would have turned completely Judaistic had not the disastrous outcome of the Palestinian revolt brought this Judaising process to its end. For the Jewish Christians were completely discredited in the eyes of their Gentile brethren because they had taken an active part in that revolt.

We come thus to the most original, but also, in my opinion, the most objectionable part of the book, namely, what Dr. Brandon has to say on the supposed political messianism of the Jewish Christians. To try and establish the case, he is led, on the one hand, to minimize the evidence of *Acts* concerning anti-Christian measures taken by Jewish authorities — martyrdom of Stephen and of James the Apostle — and, on the other hand, to overestimate the importance of that evidence in the Gospels which points to the existence of a political element in the original Christian movement — trial and condemnation of Jesus on political grounds, armed resistance to his arrest, triumphal entry into Jerusalem, attack on the ' Temple bank,' inclusion of a

ealot among the disciples, etc. I would certainly not maintain that the inds of the first followers of Jesus were absolutely untouched by political essianism. But I think it wiser not to rely too much on the *Testimonia aviana,* and at any rate to have no recourse at all to the Slavonic version Josephus' *Wars,* dear to the late Dr. Eisler's heart. It seems arbitrary reject as tendentious — which it is indeed to a certain and possibly conderable extent — the evidence of *Acts,* and, however unsatisfactory, that of egesippus, and at the same time to accept at its face value the Slavonic sephus. Even if it were authentic, which is at least very doubtful, it would ve us nothing more than the personal interpretation of one who, having no mpathy for Christianity, and standing in very friendly relations with the omans, shared their uncontrolled prejudices on the matter. But even so, the planation falls short. For if Judaic Christianity really was a revolutionary ovement against Rome, how then is the fact to be explained that not even ce were the Palestinian Christians molested and persecuted by Roman procial authority after their Master's death? In fact, we have to come as far wn as the reigns of Domitian and Trajan to find instances of a political al against members of the family of the Lord. Even then it had a strictly rsonal character, leaving the Church apparently untouched; and in the first se the accusation was found to be irrelevant.

I see no decisive reason to dismiss Hegesippus' testimony concerning the ght of the Jerusalem Christians to Pella. Dr. Brandon, who is led to do so the logic of his system, writes:

> 'It would appear, on *a priori* grounds, very improbable that pious Jews, such as we have every reason for believing the Jerusalem Christians to have been, should have chosen so thoroughly Gentile a centre for refuge' (p. 169).

is looks somewhat like a *petitio principii.* For it supposes that the Jewish ristians were in full agreement, on every possible point, with their nonristian countrymen: which we have some reason to doubt. If we admit at there was danger in staying in Jerusalem, the migration becomes very ely. The best thing to do was then to settle in Gentile environment. There e other instances of pious Jews, whose piety was not in accordance with e official one of the priests, taking refuge among the heathen: so the -called Sect of the New Covenant, when it fled to Damascus under the nace of religious persecution. In such cases principles have to yield, and afety first' becomes the watchword.

The existence, at a later date, of strictly Jewish Christian communities at lla and in its Transjordanian neighbourhood is an established fact. If we mit, which appears very likely, that they had come thither from Palestine oper, no more suitable date can be postulated for their migration than the riod of the great Jewish War; unless we admit, which is an alternative planation, that these Jewish Christians had left Jerusalem and Palestine — ssibly, as Dr. Brandon inclines to think, in some small-scale and unganized exodus — before the war, after the execution of James, the Lord's other under the menace of possible persecution.

Vis à vis messianic agitation and the national insurrection of 66–70, Jewish inion was far from being unanimous. The Essenes certainly took no active rt in the revolt. And the most famous of all rabbis of that period, Johanan ben kkai, succeeded in escaping from Jerusalem in the midst of the siege, thus rly disclaiming solidarity with his fanatically nationalistic countrymen. e may *a fortiori* admit that the Christian Jews were in similar dispositions, less we think with Dr. Brandon that there was no tension at all between m and the Jewish authorities, and that what the New Testament writings

have to say on the matter is utterly tendentious, which I feel hard to believe, in spite of his very careful and clever attempt to demonstrate it. We know from Justin Martyr (*1 Apol.* 31) that the Jewish Christians were persecuted by Bar Cochba during the second Jewish revolt (132–135), apparently because they refused to follow him. It is therefore likely that, already in 66–70, they remained outside the conflict.

National feeling and nationalistic fanaticism are by no means synonymous. Whereas the Jerusalem Christians undoubtedly had the one, there is very little evidence, if any at all, that they were moved by the other and took, as a group — there might have been individual exceptions — an active part in the revolt. To cling to the ritual Law, to the Temple and to Israel's privileges in the face of the Gentiles is one thing; to take arms against the Romans is quite another. The destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple surely was a cruel blow to the Jewish Christians. But it affords in itself a sufficient explanation of the fact 'that the Christian community of Pella appears to have played no important part in the life of the Church during the first and second centuries.' Dr. Brandon thinks that 'this insignificance would surely be strange and surprising if the Church of Jerusalem, with all its unchallenged authority and prestige, had migrated *en bloc* to the Peræan city' (p. 172). I do not think so. For the Mother Church, wherever she was at that time, must have suffered a tremendous loss of prestige from the destruction of the Temple, to which she clung with fervent devotion. Her whole conception of Christianity fell, so to say, with the Holy City. This, together with the geographical isolation from the main centres of Christianity, is, I think, quite sufficient to explain her rapid fading away into oblivion, all the more as probably not one of the Twelve was still alive after 70, except perhaps John, and none among their successors enjoyed such prestige as to impose his and his Church's influence upon Gentile Christianity.

The conditions were thus provided for a posthumous justification of Paul. Dr. Brandon has some very penetrating and illuminating remarks on this process, and on the aim and tendency of the three Synoptic Gospels, as confronted with each other, as well as of *Acts*. He sees in the Gospel of *Mark* a direct and immediate 'product of the reaction of some body of Gentile Christians to the overthrow of the Jewish national State' (p. 186). It illustrates the desire to separate Jesus from his nation and milieu, and to condemn all that was Jewish and associated with Jerusalem. A number of features and episodes of this Gospel—its particular version of Peter's messianic confession at Caesarea Philippi, with its anti-Petrine touch; its hostile attitude towards Jerusalem; its disparagement of the Twelve and defamatory account of the Lord's family — are thus given an explanation which, if not fully convincing on every point (for some of the details presented as specifically Markan are found also in *Matthew*), is at least very original and attractive. The Lukan literature, as well as the building up of the *Corpus Paulinum*, brings us one step further in the rehabilitation of Paul. The complete silence of *Acts* concerning the Church of Alexandria is taken as evidence that when Luke wrote his book this Church had succeeded Jerusalem as the citadel of Jewish Christianity and of opposition to Pauline teaching.

On the other hand, the Gospel of *Matthew* clearly expresses the Jewish Christian reaction towards the catastrophe of 70. Dr. Brandon notes in it a serious concern to explain the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and a severe attitude towards the Gentiles, as well as a counter-exaltation of Peter. He rejects the theory of the Antiochene origin of *Matthew* in favour of an Alexandrian origin, and supposes that when Peter, according to *Acts* xii, 17, left Jerusalem for 'another place' he actually went to Alexandria, as did also the more pacific among the Jewish Christians when the war of 66 broke out.

nd he sees in the Matthaean story of the Flight into Egypt 'the most vivid xpression of the consciousness of locality as felt by a Jewish Christian fugee in Alexandria' (p. 226).

All this remains, as Dr. Brandon himself admits, largely conjectural. But certainly must be taken into account and carefully examined. I cannot ater here into a detailed criticism of every point of the thesis. Although I n not at all convinced that Peter really went to Alexandria, I am quite pre-red to admit that the Alexandrian Church was in fact Jewish Christian, and at this accounts for the astonishing silence of our sources. I also accept e basic soundness of Dr. Brandon's views on early Christian evolution in neral, and specially on the importance for the Church of the catastrophe 70, as a result of which 'Christianity was in a certain sense reborn' rough 'the fusion of the idea of the (Pauline) Saviour God with the Jesus History which finds expression in the Gospels' (p. 250). But I do not see e facts in exactly the same perspective as Dr. Brandon does.

Although he emphasizes, in my opinion quite rightly, the fact that the thority of the Jerusalem Church was unchallenged, even by Paul, from the ry beginning, he seems none the less, if I have correctly understood him, admit that the Pauline type of Christianity was from the first the Gentile pe *par excellence*; and he consequently assigns to the period A.D. 55 to 66 a isis which, in my opinion, started much earlier and prevented Paul from er becoming really what he claimed to be, *i.e. the* Apostle of the Gentiles. do not think St. Paul's particular views were ever accepted, even while he as at work, by a majority among the Hellenistic Christians. Rather than describe his achievement as 'being replaced by the Jerusalem teaching and ministration' (p.152), we could perhaps say more exactly that his removal which I should date a little later than 55, possibly 58—only made the tory of his rivals more complete.

The importance of Paul's Epistles in the New Testament may easily lead to overestimate his influence in the Church, even in his lifetime. For the mber of truly Pauline communities, even if we reckon with the fact that t all his letters have been preserved, is relatively small as compared with e whole area of early Christian mission. And it is not at all certain that ey remained steadfastly true to the Pauline *Kerygma*: the epistles them-ves should incline us to doubt it. Dr. Brandon is certainly right when he nsiders that the Gospel of *Mark*, though definitely anti-Jewish and pro-uline in its inspiration, is in its form, *i.e.* historical narrative, a result of the edominance of Jewish Christian teaching, as contrasted with the esoteric d historically uninterested teaching of Paul, in the Gentile Churches between and 66. But this is not the only, nor the most significant, testimony con-rning the Jewish Christian hold on the early Gentile Church. There is other and very important one, which enables us to trace this influence still rther back. I think of the so-called Council of Jerusalem, which took place follow Goguel's chronology) probably in 44. Dr. Brandon has, in my inion, failed to value it at its full importance and to establish its real aning.

He maintains that, according to *Acts*, there was only 'demanded of the ntiles the keeping of certain rules concerning some elementary moral prin-les and some specific dietary prohibitions' and that 'the decisions were arly so completely in Paul's favour' (p. 131). Consequently, as the Lukan ord shows 'intractable discrepancies when compared with the evidence of ul's epistles,' he dismisses the evidence of *Acts* and inclines even to deny historicity of the Council itself. I do not think he is right. For a careful alysis of the 'apostolic decree' reveals that it has little or nothing to do h morals. The prohibition of blood and fornication does not apply to

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

murder and sexual misbehaviour. It refers, in my eyes quite obviously, to the eating of 'flesh with the blood thereof,' and to the Jewish 'table of kindred and affinity, wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture to marry together.' This means that the regulations thus codified are of an almost exclusively ritual character, and reproduce the so-called Noachian commandments which were imposed by the Synagogue upon the semi-proselytes. We stand on the ground of genuine mosaic and rabbinic law. The decree represents a compromise between the Pauline position of complete freedom *vis-à-vis* the ritual regulations and the strictly Judaic attitude, which claimed to impose circumcision on the Gentile converts. It is impossible to interpret it as being in Paul's favour: Paul could never have accepted it. As he himself maintains most categorically (*Gal.* ii, 6 ff.) that no condition whatever was expressed, concerning his converts, by the Jerusalem 'pillars' when he visited them on an occasion which is obviously the same as described in *Acts* xv, the only possible explanation is that which Lietzmann proposed: the decree was issued, by unilateral decision of the Apostles, after the end of the conference when Paul had already left Jerusalem. It thus marks the beginning of a vigorous campaign intended to neutralize Paul's influence wherever he had preached, and during which the Jewish Christians apparently were not always content to impose upon the Gentiles that minimum of ritual observance codified in the decree.

We have every reason to think that at least the regulations of the decree were generally accepted by the churches. If Luke, in spite of his pro-Pauline sympathies, reports the decree as a piece of canon law issued by apostolic authority for the Church universal, we may, I think, admit not only its historicity but also that it was still observed when *Acts* was being written. In fact, we know from Eusebius (EH. v, 1, 26), in his account of the persecution at Lyons (177), and from Tertullian (*Apol.*, ix, 13-14) that the Western Church still kept its regulations as late as the end of the second century. In the Eastern Church it remained in vigour even later. This plain fact clearly illustrates the limits of Pauline Christianity in the early Church. It can be maintained that, almost from the very beginning, Paul's conceptions were successfully challenged by the Jewish Christians all over the missionary field of the expanding Church. Neither does Paul's removal really initiate the crisis, nor is his rehabilitation after 70 a complete one. The early Church can be described, as a consequence of the Apostolic decree, as semi-Judaic. And semi-Judaic it remained, in its spirit if not in its theology, long after 70.

It is none the less true that the drama of 70 was, as Dr. Brandon puts it, 'the next most crucial event in the life of the Christian Church after the Resurrection experiences' (p. 251): not because the Jewish Christians, having taken part in the revolt — of this I remain unconvinced — were defeated together with their non-Christian countrymen, but because the divine verdict on City and Temple brought a tremendous confirmation to Paul's views on the Law and, at the same time, strengthened among the Gentile Christians, in face of the ever decreasing number of Jewish converts, a feeling of self-confidence. It thus gave the death-blow to Jewish Christianity outside Judea or Perea. Henceforth the Church would not adopt any more of the Jewish conceptions and usages than had already been accepted.

Our understanding of this momentous transition has been greatly strengthened by Dr. Brandon's stimulating book, a contribution of undoubted importance to the history of early Christianity. It is not the least of his merits to be, as far as I can judge, so thoroughly unprejudiced and uninfluenced by doctrinal postulates. In a time when, too often, either the very concept of historical objectivity is called in question, or history is distorted

d made the servant of conflicting theologies and *Weltanschauungen*, it is freshing to read the work of an able, erudite and uncompromising historian.

MARCEL SIMON
Université de Strasbourg

THE NEW MAN AND THE NEW WAY*

This is a book to be read with interest but caution. It is an example of a ood idea pushed to extremes. Dr. Nicoll is a distinguished doctor with a ecial interest in psychiatry. Naturally his book is influenced by his pro- ssional viewpoint. In the nineteenth century we were frequently told that sus was a great humanitarian — the greatest of all liberals. Our twentieth ntury Conrad Noels see in Jesus the pre-eminent socialist pioneer. In Dr. icoll's book we meet Jesus the medical psychiatrist, the super-Jung. One nnot help but reflect, that each generation sees Jesus as the typical and e greatest representative of whatever appears to that age to be both worthy d fashionable.

Dr. Nicoll has, however, a plausible case. It is not difficult to show that large section of the gospels deals with healing. There is as much in the ospels about the cures wrought by Jesus as about His teaching. The attempt ignore or explain away the miracles has never been wholly satisfactory or nvincing. The evangelists evidently regarded the healing ministry of Jesus significant. Dr. Nicoll tries to show that healing and teaching go together, d that the one is the complement of the other.

Dr. Nicoll begins with a chapter called 'The Language of Parables.' His ntention is that there existed an ancient language of parables and that cer- in words when used in ancient writings always had definite symbolic eaning.

> 'A parable in the Gospels is cast in the form of an ancient language now forgotten. There was a time when the language of parables could be understood. This language — the language of the parable, allegory and miracle — is lost to the humanity of to-day. But sources still remain which enable us to understand something of this ancient meaning' (p. 9).
>
> 'In the ancient language water means Truth . . . Stone and wine are both used as images for this form of Truth, but on different scales of meaning' (pp. 8-9).

Dr. Nicoll cites examples of the use of these three words in this sense om different parts of the Bible, and again makes use of this illustration in s explanation of the miracle at the wedding feast at Cana of Galilee which the theme of his third chapter.

There is, of course, much truth in what he says, but to accept his thesis hole-heartedly, would turn the Bible into a second *Faerie Queen* and we ould have to spend our time in hunting for clues to an ever elusive inner eaning, and in so doing we should often ignore the plain but simple truth aring us in the face. It has always been the belief of the Christian, that e Bible contains all that is necessary to salvation, and that this knowledge n be obtained even by the most simple-minded. Theologians have often en guilty of trying to make the plain truth difficult for the edification of e learned. If psycho-analysis is coming to the theologians' aid in this spect, we shall soon be told that the secret of the Bible is to be found in the reams of Daniel re-interpreted on a Freudian, Jungian, or Adlerian basis.

Being the son of Sir William Robertson Nicoll, our author knows his ible well, and can quote with telling effect. He also perceives connections

* *The New Man, an interpretation of some parables and miracles of Christ*, by Maurice coll. Stuart and Richards, 15/-. 1951.

which would generally pass unnoticed. The chapter entitled 'The Idea of Good being above Truth' is well worth reading. Commenting on the Parable of the Good Samaritan, Dr. Nicoll writes:

> 'To act from compassion, to act from mercy, is to act from Good itself and not from any idea of reward. Truth alone has nothing to do with compassion, nothing to do with mercy. The most merciless and atrocious acts have been done in the name of Truth. For Truth divorced from Good has nothing real in it. It has nothing to check it, nothing to unite with it, and give it any real being' (p. 52).

Dr. Nicoll's theme is that Man is capable of attaining the Kingdom of God when he himself becomes a New Man. He writes:

> 'The soul of a grub is not at the level of a butterfly and so it must lose its soul in order to find it again. By remaining a grub it saves its soul as a grub but loses its soul in another sense — that is, it loses the opportunity of transformation, and, by clinging to itself as it is, misses all that belongs to what it can become. And since Man is also capable of transformation or re-birth his soul is double in the same sense. He can keep it and remain as he is, but, by keeping it, he loses it in regard to his real destiny. Or he can lose it by not remaining as he is and then he will find it again at another level of his own inner evolution. Therefore the soul is a potentiality' (p. 65).

In the chapter on 'Faith' we reach the culmination of Dr. Nicoll's argument. He says:

> 'The real psychology of an acorn must be based on the fact that it can become an oak tree' (p. 111).

Now Man as a rule 'wants to be the same man, but better — not another man, a man reborn' (p. 117).

To enter the Kingdom of God, Man must be reborn. For this, Faith is necessary.

> 'Faith is the convinced and certain realisation of a higher level to which a man must subject everything in him' (p. 116).

We rule Nature by obeying her — we enter the Kingdom by subjecting ourselves to its higher discipline. Moreover, we can only achieve our aim when we ourselves have undergone a religious experience.

> 'He (*i.e.* Man) can only change from what he has seen for himself and never from what he is told' (p. 118).

Even though we may not follow Dr. Nicoll into all the byways of this argument, most readers of this book would agree that in his main contention the author is on sound ground. For eternal life is the Christian goal, and the gospel is the guide by which those who seek shall find.

GEOFFREY PARRISH

MODERN CHRISTOLOGY AND DEAN MATTHEWS

In *The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century*[1] Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's, has written a book of the greatest importance. His subject is the Incarnation, and what is new in his treatment is the suggestions which he makes for understanding this doctrine in terms of Jungian psychology, of modern research in parapsychology and of 'pattern philosophy.'

It is sometimes alleged that our contemporaries are not concerned with

[1] Oxford University Press, 1950, 8/6, pp. vii+88 with index.

problem of the Incarnation, but questions on this subject occur more frently than any others in religious brains trusts. It is true that Western n in these days is consciously more aware of the problem of frustration n he is of the problem of sin; he seeks for a purpose in life rather than relief from the burden of guilt. Yet this quest for a purpose in life is sely connected with the problem of the Incarnation: if a man believes that universe is a fortuitious and meaningless concourse of sub-atomic pares, then he is driven to conclude that Jesus of Nazareth was, at best, a lime idealist pathetically deceived; if, on the other hand, he believes that us is the Revelation of God, then he must conclude that the universe has urpose, and that for man this is a purpose for good which will not fail. Dr. Matthews' first two chapters, devoted to the New Testament and to classical Christian Theology respectively, are clearly designed to make the k comprehensible for those who have no technical knowledge of theology, l in this they succeed. He remarks that the pictures presented by the rth Gospel and by the Synoptics are incapable of reconciliation. He nits that:

'The theological presuppositions behind the Synoptic Gospels are different from those which dominate the Fourth Gospel, but they are no less obvious' (p. 10).

He then poses the question:

'Do we have in the Synoptic Gospels, in the main, an authentic portrait of the real Jesus, or have imported theological interpretations so distorted the picture that the real man has been lost under the dogmatic vestments?' (p. 10).

Without discussing this question in detail the Dean accepts the former rnative; he declares:

'To say then that the doctrine of the Incarnation is true and at the same time that we know practically nothing for certain about the real Jesus of Nazareth is to bring together two contradictory propositions' (p. 12).

Matthews is not

'Alarmed by the suggestion that in the original statement of the Gospel there are modes of thought which we should perhaps regard as illusory. . . . Illusion simply means that the ideas which were available were imperfect. . . . That they are not our thoughts does not prove that they were worse. The reality they expressed was in the mind and heart of Jesus and there is ground enough for the faith of the early Church that Jesus is Lord and that God was in Christ.'

At this point a distinction must be drawn. On certain historical and ntific problems we do possess more knowledge than was available to the y Christians. If we fail to recognise this fact or to face its consequences, n we are guilty of the sin of burying our talent in the earth. On the other d we may agree with the Dean that our own unconscious presuppositions, pposed to positive knowledge, are not true merely because we hold them; n age must admit that its own framework of ideas is relative. We must agree most cordially that the doctrine of the person of Christ is not royed by the fact that it was originally expressed in the framework of s of the first century.

In his second chapter Dr. Matthews notes how the Christology which eloped in New Testament days was reformulated in the Patristic period erms of the later Platonism. He feels that the Church was fortunate in ing this philosophy available, but deplores the fact it had no adequate

concept of personality and that the classical Christology was consequently impoverished.

Dr. Matthews then proceeds to offer certain very tentative suggestions based upon psychology, parapsychology and 'pattern philosophy.' Speculations of this nature may be of value in two spheres, doctrine and evangelisation: if these recent studies have attained genuine new knowledge about the nature of man or of the universe, they offer the possibility of a deeper understanding of Christian doctrine which is concerned with man and with the universe as well as with God; if the conclusions reached in these studies become widely accepted, then a restatement of Christian doctrine in such terms will be an aid to evangelisation. It would appear that some new knowledge has been acquired with the result that Dr. Matthews' suggestions open the way to a limited but nevertheless extremely valuable advance in the field of Christian doctrine. The conclusions of these new branches of knowledge have already been accepted in some circles, so that restatement of this nature has already a limited value for evangelistic purposes which will be enhanced if the conclusions of Jungian psychology, etc., should prove acceptable in wider circles.

In the sphere of psychology the Dean makes two points. He first asks whether there was 'libido' in Jesus Christ. He concludes that there was and maintains that 'libido' is not in itself sinful although misdirection of 'libido' clearly is. He secondly raises the problem presented by the theory of Christ's 'becoming man' in its soteriological aspect. He accept Jung's theory of a 'racial unconscious' and suggests that in addition to His influence upon the individual Christ may affect all mankind through the 'racial unconscious' which, being a man, He shares with us. Similar valuable speculations with regard to the Atonement have been made by Dr. C. T. Chapman in *The Conflict of the Kingdoms*.[2] Although I personally share the Dean's belief that Jung is correct where he disagrees with Freud, it is desirable that Christian Theology should be provisionally restated in Freudian as well as in Jungian terms. This task has been attempted by Dr. R. S. Lee, Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, in *Freud and Christianity*.[3]

Dr. Matthews accepts the validity, in general, of the results obtained in recent investigations into telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. These are admirably expounded in *The Personality of Man*.[4] He suggests that Christ's knowledge of man may have been due in part to something like telepathy. He refrains from applying this suggestion to the doctrine of Grace, but he notes that the facts investigated by students of parapsychology are inconsistent with, and therefore refute, the old-fashioned philosophy of materialism.

When he goes on to consider 'pattern philosophy' the Dean is not so much adducing newly discovered facts as suggesting a new description. When he says:

> 'A personal life of which it could be said that it is of the same pattern as the temporal will of God would be the supreme revelation of God; it would be God manifest "in the flesh"' (p. 71)

his originality is in the sphere of language. This in itself is no small gain when we remember the prevalence of the concept of 'pattern' in contemporary scientific thought.

Dr. Matthews maintains, however, that 'pattern philosophy' is not sufficient to enable us to comprehend the Incarnation. He also thinks of Christ

[2] Hutchinson's University Library, 1951.

[3] James Clarke & Co., 1948. cf. also Dr. Lee's article 'A Means of Grace,' in the *Liberal Evangelical* for July, 1951.

[4] G. N. M. Tyrrell, Pelican.

One who was continuously inspired, not intermittently as the prophets e. He admits that 'The whole meaning of the Incarnation is not to be austed under the category of inspiration,' but contends that when we are cerned with the person of Christ as a phenomenon in the order of history fact of inspiration is the safest guide we have (p.82).

The Dean has not attempted to work out his thesis exhaustively. He given us a valuable foretaste of what can be done by thinking upon such s. The importance of his work will be still further enhanced if others y out the intention of the author by pursuing the path which he has cated.

D. E. H. WHITELEY

A NEW STUDY OF THE ATONEMENT*

There is perhaps no Christian doctrine of which fresh considerations appear frequently as that of the Atonement. Nor is this surprising since it bears closely upon the problem of man's salvation.

'Although,' says Dr. Chapman, 'it is the creation of God, this universe is involved in a vast conflict of spiritual forces, the Kingdom of God at war with that of evil. . . . In this conflict of the kingdoms man's fate is inextricably bound up because he is within and part of the divine creation which has become the battleground of opposing spiritual forces. His well-being depends on two factors, the ultimate triumph of God over evil, involving the destruction of the latter, and his ability to share in the divine victory' (p. 136).

ntially, therefore, the pattern of salvation involves two things, the expulon of evil and the impulsion of good; and the Atonement is the Christian wer to that universal need.

With great skill Dr. Chapman traces the course of this pattern from the de religious instincts of primitive man down to the biblical record where he Cross of Christ he finds its consummation. Then the pattern is followed ough the thought and experience of the Early Church, in which way we given an excellent critique and summary of the patristic theories about it. ally, in the light of this survey, the author considers the significance of Christian message of salvation for to-day.

Such, in bald outline, is the plan of the book; and in the treatment of both ts of his theme — the expulsion of evil and the impulsion of good, which ether make up the pattern of salvation — Dr. Chapman stimulates search- thought and criticism.

To begin with there are the difficulties which a dualist position involves. is if the powers of evil and of good are both eternal we are committed to atalist point of view and the only hope of salvation becomes escape into *vana*. On the other hand, if evil is to have an end it must surely have had eginning as well. Whence then was its origin? That is, indeed, as Dr. apman says, 'enshrouded in mystery.' But, as the title of the book sugts, he believes that the forces of evil have an independent and external stence which God will ultimately abolish. Consequently he declares:

'The life and teaching of Jesus is to be seen and only properly understood against the background of the great conflict between the Kingdom of God and that of Satan. The devil's kingdom was as much a reality to Jesus as the demons who formed part of it' (p. 45).

The Conflict of the Kingdoms. By Clifford Thomas Chapman, M.Th., Ph.D. chinson. 1951. 7/6.)

In view of this Dr. Chapman cannot sympathize with the Old Testament prophets in so far as they refused to acknowledge the existence of any spiritual power opposed to Yahweh or not dependent upon Him. Indeed, the expulsive side of the pattern of salvation nearly came to grief at their hands altogether, and it was only by the explanation that evil is God's punishment of sin that the righteous character of God was itself preserved. This of course was a manifestly inadequate and even false solution of the problem. None the less, there is immense grandeur in II *Isaiah's* affirmation, 'I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil. I am the Lord that doeth all these things.' Indeed, how can it be otherwise unless the power of evil is no less ultimate than the power of God?

Turning to the second half of the pattern, the impulsion of good, Dr. Chapman believes that animal sacrifice — the *rationale* of which has been so often debated — had especially the attainment of this in view. He is deeply impressed by the ubiquity of the practice, so much so that he questions whether the prophets, and even Jesus himself, really doubted its value. Of the prophets it is doubtless true

> 'that in general [they] stressed the fact that the inward attitude of mind of the worshipper, his repentance and his desire for forgiveness, were of more importance than his outward act of offering a sacrifice' (p. 37).

But there is no getting away from the fact that in many places both the prophets and the psalms are quite explicit that animal sacrifice is futile and without meaning and emphatically not what Yahweh requires. Admittedly such a break with universal practice is sufficiently astonishing; but monotheism itself involved a no less decisive and startling change.

That Jesus was not at one with the prophets in this respect is also hard to believe. In the Old Testament it was undoubtedly the prophetic teaching in general which appealed to him most strongly. The Law he quotes with approval only when that teaching is reflected in it. Yet it is true, on the other hand, as Dr. Chapman points out, that Jesus was careful to observe what the Law required and recommended others to do the same. With regard to the cleansing of the Temple it is suggested that:

> 'His courageous action in driving out the money changers and those who sold doves for the sacrifices was an attack, not on the Temple sacrifices, but on the abuse of them for monetary gain. This does not suggest that he attached little importance to the sacrifices or thought lightly of their sanctity. Rather the opposite' (p. 58).

This is certainly a shrewd and novel point. But against it may be set the words from *Hosea*, twice repeated by St. Matthew on the lips of Jesus, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice.' Their appearance in two different contexts might well suggest that they were a favourite quotation of his, and their double appearance in the most Jewish of the Gospels can leave little room for doubting their authenticity. Altogether it is difficult to agree with Dr. Chapman when he says:

> 'It is comparatively certain that when [Jesus] told the people not to think that He had come to destroy "the Law and the Prophets" because, on the contrary, He had come to fulfil them, He was thinking of the whole heritage of the past, including the system of religious sacrifices (p. 59).

None the less, whatever the attitude of Jesus may have been to the sacrificial system, Dr. Chapman is convinced that he looked upon his death as a sacrifice offered for man which directly affected the relation between man and God

rt from the exemplary moral influence exercised by it. This, so Dr. pman argues, is shown in particular by the language used by Jesus at the t Supper and is reinforced by the agreement of the rest of the New Testat, outside the Synoptic Gospels, in viewing his death in this way.

Now the sacrificial nature of that death is in a sense not, of course, in bute. It is the *nature* of the sacrifice that may be questioned, and the guage used by Jesus at the Last Supper — supported as it is so little by t he said or did elsewhere — is really not convincing evidence that he ed upon his death as of such a nature that man's forgiveness would be ditional upon it. The only words which do clearly suggest this are the thean ' unto the remission of sins ' (*Matt.* xxvi, 28), which Dr. Chapman its to be an editorial addition. But there is abundant evidence from his ching to show that, on the contrary, Jesus held with the prophets that d's forgiveness was conditional upon sincere repentance and nothing else. parable of the Prodigal Son is of course, the outstanding example of , but Dr. Chapman himself gives a list of other instances (p. 57) hardly explicit. Surely we must always interpret what is doubtful and ambiguous he light of what is luminously clear, and not *vice versa*. There is no conliction involved if we suppose Jesus to have believed that his death would uce men to repent and be forgiven — that in this sense his death was a rifice of perfect obedience to the Father's will. But if at the Last Supper is taught that his death was pre-requisite by mystic necessity to man's giveness, how is that to be reconciled with all that he taught about foreness elsewhere?

Dr. Chapman would probably reply that in the former case we are faced a contradiction between the Synoptic Gospels and the rest of the New tament which is still harder to reconcile or even account for. And yet we e to remember that Jesus certainly was often misunderstood by his owers. In any case it has also to be remembered that they lived in an osphere where the language of sacrificial metaphor would inevitably gest itself, and there was the great Suffering Servant passage (*Isaiah* 53) heir authoritative scriptures. Even so, it has been pointed out by Dean shdall :

> ' Much more frequently than not salvation is attributed, not specifically to the death of Christ, but to His coming, His preaching, His example, His revelation of the Father, His resurrection ' (*Ideas and Ideals,* p. 148).

rthermore, it has also to be borne in mind that outside the Synoptic spels, the New Testament consists mainly of the writings of only three ple. There are the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the annine writings. In the last named, as Dr. Chapman admits, there is, with able exceptions, little emphasis on the death of Christ as an atoning sacri. Even in the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* saturated as it is with a wealth of rificial imagery, the writer comes to the heart of the matter (chap. x, 5-11) by citing an anti-sacrificial psalm (*Ps.* xl), which turns our attention n the propitiatory Temple sacrifices to the exemplary sacrifice of perfect dience. St. Paul had not known Jesus after the flesh and it is doubtful far he was acquainted with his teaching. If there is some difference ween that teaching and his (St. Paul's) own, this is surely less surprising n if there were what amounts to a contradiction within the teaching of us himself.

But if, as Dr. Chapman insists, ' The " Moral " or " Subjective " theories he Atonement . . . are obviously deficient when judged by New Testat evidence ' ; if indeed ' Jesus did something, quite independent of man's ponse to it . . . did something which altered the relationship between God

and man, making complete reconciliation possible' (p. 127), how was this effected?

After a fascinating survey of the various patristic and scholastic theories of the Atonement, Dr. Chapman rejects the theory of Anselm and its antecedents no less than the subjective theory of Abelard. It regards man as saved not from sin at all but from the divine justice, and as Abelard himself points out:

> 'The death of Jesus at the hands of sinful men, far from making atonement and reconciling them to God, should rather have increased the wrath of God against mankind, since this was a greater sin than Adam's' (p. 117).

Accordingly, Dr. Chapman returns to the older theory which represents Christ's death as a victory over the powers of evil — a theory long rejected or overlooked because the crude notion that Christ was a ransom offered to the devil had become attached to it.

> 'By sharing in the victory, a man is enabled to repent of past sin, break free from controlling evil influences, and enter the Kingdom of God' (p. 139).

Yet still the question raises itself, How is man to do this? Dr. Chapman's clearest answer is given on p. 137:

> 'Christ came to break through (the) trammels of evil by His perfect obedience to God. Since then there had been a weakened force of evil opposed by the abiding power of Christ, available for man's assistance, together with the example of the obedience of Jesus and the encouragement of His victory manifested in His resurrection.'

But this emphasis upon Christ's example, upon his coming rather than upon his death, brings Dr. Chapman's position very close to the Moral or Subjective theory of the Atonement previously rejected. If we include within the power of Christ's example — as surely we must — the new realization of the power of the Spirit, which came at Pentecost, the divergence virtually disappears.

Dean Rashdall is said to have complained that whilst the critics of his great work on the Atonement objected that there was more in that doctrine than a subjective theory found room for, they would never make clear in what that 'more' consisted. Dr. Chapman attempts to do this.

The truth is, surely, that all the doctrines of the Atonement subsequently developed have their seeds in the New Testament itself. Both theory and experience are to be found there thoroughly mixed together, and a critical choice is therefore inevitable *from within the New Testament itself*. Three things in particular may be said in favour of the moral influence or exemplarist theory: (*a*) it alone is rational in the broadest sense; (*b*) it is the one element common to all the Atonement theories; and (*c*) it is—special pleading apart—the only one that agrees fully with the plain teaching of Jesus Christ. Perhaps this last is why it has the two foregoing merits as well.

The value of a small book on a great and controversial subject may well be measured by the questions it raises and the amount of thought it provokes. It should be suggestive rather than definitive. *The Conflict of the Kingdoms* fulfils these conditions admirably.

D. L. Scott

PAPALISM IN U.S.A.

A distinguished judge once gave this counsel to a young colleague: ...etter be strong and wrong than weak and right.' Such sceptical cynicism, ...ich undermines justice itself, has been in every age the sheet-anchor motto ...all authoritarian régimes. It amuses and humiliates; causes laughter and ...me.

Mr. Paul Blandshard recently wrote for the American public a book which, ...tunately, can now be read in England under the title *Freedom and Catholic ...wer* (Secker & Warburg, 1951, 18/-). It is the most truthful and the ...ongest discussion known to me of the modern grave abuse of Truth and ...use of Power represented by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United ...tes of America. In an age of great confusion this book will help to dissi... e smoke-screens, not only in America but also in this island. Truthful ...man Catholics will be as thankful for it as others, if they be permitted to ...d it. It is written from within: both from within the whole Roman ...dition, and from within a truthful heart. No statements are made without ...horitative, frequently hierarchical, documentation. And nothing is written ...malice: though the mind that confuses 'judicial balance' or 'discretion' ...h 'truthfulness' will not be happy about the method and the substance ...the presentation; nor the mind that regards religion as a useful ally in the ...at game of Power. This book will be as influential to-day as was George ...mon's *Infallibility of the Church* two generations ago.

The Roman Church now claims to be the largest religious institution in ... United States — three times as large as the Methodist Church, the largest ...gle Protestant denomination. Statistics, however, mislead: especially the ...tistics of any institution based on the claim to infallibility and controlled ...the passion of Power. Yet the growth of the Papal system in U.S.A. ...as patent as the spread of Marxism in Eastern Europe. Each understands ...other very well. Both have drunk from the same well. 'Ten thousand ...akers can live in an American community all their lives and not attract half ... attention that ten thousand Catholics do, especially if the Catholics have ... energetic bishop who understands modern publicity methods.' Obviously, ...erica's problem is a world problem. For the Roman variety of 'Power-...stem' is not alone.

I can only here call attention to the fields of American life where Mr. ...nshard shines his torch. The main chapters are on 'How the Hierarchy ...rks,' 'Church, State and Democracy,' 'Education and the Catholic Mind,' ...he Church and Medicine,' 'Sex, Birth Control and Eugenics,' 'Marriage, ...vorce and Annulment,' 'Censorship and Boycott,' 'Science, Scholarship ...l Superstition,' 'Fascism, Communism and Labour,' 'The Catholic Plan ... America.' Since the United States is the chief source of money for Rome ...day — as it is an important source for other people and systems — the ...blem is great indeed. 'There are no Catholic regiments in the army, but ...re is a Catholic organisation for almost every other aspect of American ...' 'Whenever any issue arises in Congress which may or might affect ...tholic interests, a seasoned lobbyist in priestly garb is likely to appear in ...Congressman's office, reminding the legislator that 26,000,000 Catholics ...America feel such and so about this matter.'

Mr. Blanshard's facts about the appointment of bishops should be ...utary in England.

> 'The mechanism for the screening of potential bishops is so thorough that there is virtually no possibility of the appointment of any bishop who is not completely subservient to his own bishop and to the hierarchy. Obedience is an essential qualification for securing or holding office.

> Every two years every bishop in every nation must forward to his metropolitan a list of priests he considers worthy of episcopacy; after the nominees have been investigated, the names are sent on to the Apostolic Delegate of the Pope in that country, and then to the Congregation of the Consistory for further sifting. The Pope and the Pope only has the final right of approval, and the Pope can and does at times select bishops without going through the Congregation of the Consistory.'

The chapter on 'Censorship and Boycott' raises an acute issue for all, in every country, who express opinions and state facts contrary to the interests of Papal Power.

> 'Ordinarily the hierarchy boycotts heresy more ruthlessly than vulgarity. It subjected the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* to a critical siege for years because its biography of the Virgin Mary suggested that the Apostles knew nothing about the Virgin Birth. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* changed a few words but stood by the substance of its interpretation.'
>
> 'The machinery that the Church uses in the United States to enforce its boycott of unfriendly literature is quite elaborate. There is machinery for handling books by non-Catholics and machinery for sifting out every printed work of Catholics that touches on religion and morals. Non-Catholic publishers who print criticism of Catholic policy are threatened with boycotts and flooded with very unpleasant letters of protest. As a result of this type of pressure scarcely any publishers in the United States will even consider any manuscript that might expose them and their textbooks to a Catholic boycott.'

The sordid story of the mighty superstition associated with the new European shrine at Fatima in Portugal is, by this time, familiar to all — as familiar as the English Roman hierarchical hopes concerning the Kentish centre that it will assist 'the Conversion of England.' Official Rome has not changed much since the days of Erasmus's *Colliquies* or since Wesley said that he knew no one who had a better claim to the title of 'Anti-Christ.'

Mr. Blanshard maintains as a positive way of dealing with this truly terrible misuse and abuse of Power that there is no alternative for the champions of Freedom but to build a resistance movement.

> 'It is scarcely necessary to say that a resistance movement can have no place for bigots or for the enemies of the Catholic *people* . . . Its sole purpose should be to resist the anti-democratic social policies of the hierarchy and to fight against every intolerant or separatist feature of those policies.'

This book ought not to be damped down.

C. J. Wright

WHY CONTINUE TO DISSENT?*

This collection of essays and addresses by the former Principal of the Unitarian College, Manchester, will be of great interest to all sympathisers with liberal Christianity. There are essays on liberal nonconformist worthies of the past, Joseph Ryder (1733-68), Theophilus Lindsey (1723-1808) — at one time a Church of England clergyman, Ebenezer Latham (1688-1754), and Daniel Mace (d. 1758), who was a pioneer in New Testament criticism, and whose work has failed to receive the recognition it deserved. He published

* *Essays and Addresses.* By H. McLachlan. (Manchester University Press. 1951. 21/-.)

he New Testament in Greek and English in 2 vols. in 1729. There is also uch information about the Dissenting Academies and the valuable educa- onal work they did when the universities were barred to all but members of e Established Church. Of interest too is the essay on John Dalton, Quaker s well as scientist. On his death in 1844 he was given a public funeral.

> 'It was the wish of his fellow citizens (of Manchester) that he should be interred in their ancient church — three years later, the Cathedral — but permission was refused. Hence, after lying in state in the Town Hall, his body was followed by a huge procession, from which as a class the clergy of the established church alone were absent, and buried in the cemetery at Ardwick Green.'[1]

Perhaps the essay, 'Why Continue to Dissent?' will be of most interest readers of *The Modern Churchman*. Among other things exception is ken by liberal Nonconformists to

> 'the imposition, as a condition of church membership, of certain rites and ceremonies, the recognition of the indisputable authority of early church councils, together with the repudiation of that of later Protestant assemblies, and the acceptance of the unhistorical theory of apostolic succession.'

Of course the Unitarian attitude towards reunion with the Church of ngland, or with other Christian bodies, is bound to be somewhat different om that of the Free Church Federal Council which accepts the traditional reeds as a necessary basis. After all, as Martineau, quoted by Dr. lacLachlan, said, there is not much point in blending religions by dissolving iem.

> 'During the more than seventy years since Martineau spoke, the unreality and incredibility of creeds and articles have been more clearly demonstrated by the scientist, the historian, and the student of comparative religion. The forms of thought in which they are cast are foreign to us.'

Dr. MacLachlan quotes the passage in the Introduction to the Report of ie Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine, wherein the Primate recognises ie position of those who can affirm the truth of the Incarnation without ccepting the historicity of the Virgin Birth or physical Resurrection of hrist, though the creeds declare otherwise. His comment is somewhat rastic:

> 'Surely there is little in modern commercial ethics, often severely condemned, so morally indefensible as these attempts to make words mean one thing to one man, and another to another, in the effort to secure agreement to recite solemn affirmations in religious service.'

Perhaps the matter is not so simple as that. Most liberal Churchmen ccept the creeds as formulae expressing Christian beliefs in terms appro- riate to the mental climate of the period in which they were composed. That imate is no longer ours, but the Christian religion should be able to survive succession of such climates, and has in fact done so. But this necessitates certain latitude of interpretation, doctrinal development without it would be mpossible. Logic can be pressed too far; it can become a form of literalism nd legalism. After all, if the clergy of the Established Church are to be ıken to task for sitting too lightly to the creeds, it seems illogical to blame ıose Manchester clergy for refusing burial in their parish church to one who,

[1] Thirty years later, in 1874, Dr. MacLachlan reminds us, the Birmingham clergy, vited to be present, absented themselves from the ceremony of unveiling the statue of oseph Priestley.

though a distinguished scientist, as a Quaker attached small value to creeds or sacraments. Those clergy were indeed too logical — and Liberals can be over-logical too in such matters.

Those who read these essays will rise from the perusal of them with a heightened sense of the debt that our culture, religious and other, owes to liberal nonconformity and to the Unitarians in particular. J.C.H.

CORNISH EVANGELICALISM, 1735—1760 A.D.

The great value of *The Early Cornish Evangelicals*,[1] by the Rev. G. C. B. Davies, is its record of the 18th century revival in Cornwall—other than by the coming of John Wesley—which six and more parochial clergy achieved under the initial leadership of Samuel Walker, curate of Truro, who wrote to the great visitor:—

> 'Do you ask what I wish you to do? . . . The general advice I would offer, is to follow your own conscience . . . Keep your eye on the word of God, and forget not your office as a minister of the Church of England . . . and then give way to the dictates of your own mind, without regard to any consideration whatsoever. Such simplicity of conduct will give you great ease, whatever be the issue' (p. 109).

Later in his life, after describing his own work to a non-conformist Minister, Walker added:—

> 'All this is the regular way without any connection with the Methodists, whom I desire to love, but have many reasons against joyning. My hope is that this work will be yet further carryd on among the *Regulars*' (p. 173).

Samuel Walker's influence from within the Church of England, on his own and later generations, Mr. Davies has carefully presented (and indexed) against the arresting background of the times which at bottom would seem to have altered little during two centuries. Most perplexing—and still how familiar!—was the spiritual condition of the age described by Walker thus:—

> '. . . yet what a people! A quarter part of them never enter the church doors. Too many reject what they hear, not a few turning it into ridicule. Above all things it breaks my heart to attend their sick beds, where I too often find them secure and ignorant in the hardness of their hearts . . . yet so uninstructed as to leave me at a loss where to begin with them' (p. 139.)

How he began and ended and to what extent his persistence did effect conversion, the reader may judge for himself in the chapters on Walker's early years, on his clerical club, pastoralia, theology and friends (one of whom gives[2] an astounding summary of Walker's working week), on his closing years and in the author's conclusion:

> 'The whole success of Walker's societies, in his own view, lay in his ordering their conduct himself, holding it was unwise to commit too much power into untried hands. Thus the Walker-Wesley correspondence made clear the lines on which the two parties, Methodists and Evangelicals, were to proceed: the Methodists into formal separation due to administration of the sacraments by the former lay preachers; and the Evangelicals in loyal adherence to the parochial system' (p. 220).

[1] *The Early Cornish Evangelicals*, 1735-60. A study of Walker of Truro and others. By G. C. B. Davies, M.A., B.D., Rector of North Tamerton, Cornwall. (Published for the Church Historical Society by S.P.C.K. 1951. Pp. 229. 16/6.)

[2] On p. 172.

'Walker lived in a day when the main business of earnest Christians was to reassert the very fundamental truths of revealed religion, and his teaching, supported by his life and energetic witness, was of more importance than his churchmanship, devoted Anglican though he was' (p. 221).

How relevant to our contemporary situation—changed as our conception of revelation must be!

The Early Cornish Evangelicals is not merely an exhaustive historical record. It gives a vivid picture of the influence Church of England clergy can have who serve the Kingdom of God as the basis of their churchmanship with enlightened courage and perseverance. Everyone who bemoans the declining influence of *Ecclesia Anglicana* should read this book, particularly in the Diocese of Truro where he may find — as this reviewer has done — much of interest concerning his own parish.

W. T. A. Philpott

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

Who wrote the Old Testament, and why?

Among a multitude of similar efforts *A Foreword to the Old Testament*,[1] by H. St. J. Hart, Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, is a volume of outstanding quality in its literary style, its method of treatment and in much of the information provided. Although of necessity it deals with many aspects of its theme it is, like the Old Testament itself, a unity and pre-eminently a spiritual and moral unity — indeed, such is the felicity of its style it would not be inappropriate to describe it as a poetical unity.

The author of the *Introduction* in its sub-title describes the volume as *An Essay of Elementary Introduction*. This is characteristic of the modesty which permeates his treatment of his theme, but those who have been readers, and not only readers but also students, of the Old Testament for years will find it well worth while to acquaint themselves with Mr. Hart's methods of presentation and exposition. Mr. Hart is erudite linguistically and historically, but he is a master of his learning and knows how to use it as a means of inspiration and illumination. When he opens the door you do not find yourself looking into a dim and dusty cupboard but at an expansive view — the Valley of Humiliation in the foreground, and beyond it the Delectable Mountains and in the far distance the bright light falling on the walls and gates of the Celestial City. Mr. Hart sees the relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament as a plain tale of two cities.

> 'The one is the Jerusalem of old Jewry, the capital city for many generations of God's ancient people, the Jews. . . . The other of our two Bible cities is another Jerusalem, the Jerusalem not made with hands, the heavenly Jerusalem of the followers of Jesus. . . . Their true citizenship was in heaven. They claimed to be a newer and truer Israel. . . . Membership of their society depended not on the ties of blood but on faith in Jesus Christ. . . . Broadly speaking, the New Testament is concerned with the New Jerusalem, the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, which is properly a part of the Old Testament, are the documents of the Jerusalem of this world, the city of David.'

Mr. Hart points out (following Epictetus) that the real religious conflict between Jews and Pagans was not whether holiness ought to be observed but

[1] *A Foreword to the Old Testament*. By H. St. J. Hart. (Adam and Charles Black. 51. 10/6.)

what constitutes holiness. For the Jews there was only one holiness, the holiness of Jehovah: 'Be ye holy for I am holy.' And for the Jew there was only one supremely holy place — the Temple in Jerusalem. Yet there was something else more holy even than the Temple — not a place but a book, the Old Testament — the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Mr. Hart appropriately illustrates this:

> 'The books dominated the Temple, and could save the faith of pharisaic Judaism, even when the Temple was destroyed by Roman Titus in 70 A.D., and the victory coins bearing the legend "judaea capta" seemed to mark the end. But we read "that Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai went out from Jerusalem and Rabbi Joshua followed him. . . . Then said Rabbi Johanan "Grieve not, we have an atonement equal to the Temple, the doing of loving deeds, as it is said I desire mercy, and not sacrifice"' (p. 175).

It was at this point that the old Religion of Israel passes into the Religion of the New Israel and the Lord Jesus succeeds Moses.

H.D.A.M.

BRAINS TRUST

BIRTH NARRATIVES IN THE GOSPELS

From J. L. Williams.

I venture to submit to you this problem for your consideration.

During the past fifty years and more, I have listened to many Christmas sermons and addresses. Invariably the speakers assumed that the wonderful and beautiful narratives surrounding the birth of Christ were historical and factual events. If this assumption is correct, the following considerations seem to me unavoidable. (1) It was revealed to a number of people that the Babe Jesus was none other than the long-promised Messiah. (2) The recipients did not conceal this startling disclosure. That is to say, the Wise Men, the shepherds, Simeon and Anna declared openly what they knew. (3) Such tidings would be momentous to the Jews, and would tend to spread like wild-fire. (4) We should naturally expect its proclamation to cause much commotion throughout Palestine, with the Child Jesus becoming the centre of nation-wide attraction. (5) To our surprise, when we turn to the rest of the New Testament we find no trace of any such repercussion. To Jesus' hearers in Nazareth He seemed an ordinary man until He commenced teaching and healing (*Mark* vi, 2-3). When the disciples proclaimed Him the Christ after the Resurrection, they did not mention the supernatural disclosures accomanying His birth as proof of His Messiahship. Their ignorance of them is difficult to account for but their omission of the stories if known to them is more remarkable. We should expect John the Baptist to have knowledge of these birth-wonders, but according to the source Q, what prompted his query, 'Art thou the coming one? etc.,' was the report of Jesus' healing powers. The statement that the relatives of Jesus thought Him out of His mind (*Mark* iii, 21) is hard to account for if the birth-narratives really happened.

Commenting on the relation between John the Baptist and Jesus. Dr. E. F. Scott writes: 'There can be little doubt that the inference to be drawn from this Marcan narrative (of the Baptism) is the true one. John had no presentiment that in Jesus the Messiah stood before him; and still less did he point Him out to others as the Greater One of whom he had

oken. If he had done so, the whole ministry of Jesus would necessarily ave taken another course. From the first He would have been the centre an awestruck interest and expectancy, of which we can find no trace in the rlier portion of the record. The quiet labours of the Galilaean months ould have been impossible; the gradual disclosure of the Messianic claim the disciples would have been superfluous and meaningless.' (*The Kingdom nd the Messiah*, p. 83.)

As I see it, that comment is quite applicable to the Birth Narratives, if eir precognition and declaration of the Messiahship of the Child Jesus is terpreted literally and factually.

JOHN L. WILLIAMS

eply by Dr. Major.

I doubt if there is a single modern New Testament scholar of reputation ho would disagree with the conclusions expressed by Mr. J. L. Williams.

In Oxford University, Willoughby Charles Allen, Sir Wm. Ramsay, rofessor Headlam, were the last outstanding New Testament scholars to aintain the historical validity of the birth narratives which Mr. J. L. Williams uestions.

Canon Streeter's analysis of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels indicate early that the two earlier sources *Q* and *Mark* give no historical support to e special birth contributions of *L* and *M*.

The Pauline Epistles which were written before the appearance of the ospels of *Luke* and *Matthew* make no reference to the Virgin Birth.

If, as the result of this acceptance of modern New Testament criticism, hristians are compelled to disbelieve in the Virgin Birth, this does not mpel rejection of belief in the *fact* of the Incarnation but it does demand a ndamental change in the presentation of the *mode* or *method* of the carnation. When this is achieved the result is not loss but gain.

H.D.A.M.

ETERNAL LIFE

uestion.

'By "Eternal Life" do Christians mean the endless prolongation of istence in time? And if not, what do they mean by the expression?'

r. L. Patterson's reply.

A. One is reminded of the rhyme about the old washerwoman whose idea heaven was 'to do nothing for ever and ever.' Even the lines of a Christian mn suggest a similar idea, when we sing, 'What rapture would it be, rostrate before thy throne to lie, and gaze and gaze on Thee.' Interminable ertia, or monotonous repetition of the same act, would afflict an intelligent purposeful human being with exquisite boredom. But eternal life is not e that. If eternal life consists in the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ th here and hereafter, it belongs to past, present, and future alike. At esent we can only know God and Christ during our own individual life-mes, but in the future life we shall be freed from those physical restrictions.

The soul, existing in a spiritual form, is freed from the limitations of time d space. The body in the temporal life can be here at one moment and ere at another, but it cannot be in two places at once. Time and Space are vo aspects of motion, *e.g.*, a man travels fifty miles from London to righton in fifty-five minutes by train, and by aeroplane in a quarter of the me. But soul or spirit is not subject to the same spatial and temporal

restrictions. The same person can be present to other persons not successively, but simultaneously within the spiritual universe, which is neither enclosed nor extended in space, nor can it be traversed in time.

The experience of the soul in the timeless order is an Eternal Now. Its life is not divided into an endless succession of days, months, and years. The past has not perished, because it is retained in memory, and the so-called future is already present to the spiritual consciousness. We are often told that a drowning man sees the whole of his past life in a flash. That may or may not be actually true, but if one could see the whole of one's life in one moment, then the consciousness of time, in which one had done so many things and thought so many thoughts, would be absent.

But it is not sufficient to realize that Eternal Life is not the endless succession of separate or continuous events in future time. We want to know what Eternal Life really is. It is difficult to imagine or describe a world of which we have as yet no first-hand, personal experience. Whatever we know about the spiritual world has been revealed to us by Christ in His teaching or by His apostles, especially St. Paul and St. John, but we are well aware that their description of the unseen world is purely symbolical. Still we might venture to affirm that Eternal Life consists in a deeper knowledge of God and Christ and departed spirits, and a finer and fuller fellowship with God and Christ and the spirits of 'just men made perfect.' It is obvious that knowledge about God, such as Christ revealed about Him in His earthly life, is not the same as knowledge of Him, but we hope to see Him face to face, and know Him as He is. The same may be applied to all departed spirits, known to us or unknown. This personal knowledge would lead on naturally to fellowship. St. John speaks of fellowship with the Father and the Son, and fellowship with our fellow-men and women, but we cannot expect to attain this ideal in any full measure in this life, in which we are separated from one another by circumstance, environment, and occupation. We look forward to the life in which we shall be freed from these spatial and temporal limitations, when we shall enjoy that perfect fellowship which we describe in pictorial language as Heaven.

Mr. Hardwick's reply.

'Eternity is an idea of which we can have no notion or experience.' The Christian concept of eternity 'means absolute timelessness, something beyond time and incommensurable with it.' The transcendent Creator must also be beyond time, since time was created along with the creation. The world did not have a beginning in time; it is time that had its beginning with the world—*i.e.*, the cosmos.

It is admittedly impossible for human faculties to understand eternity, though the mystics claim to have had glimpses of it. But can we understand time? 'As long as nobody asks us, we seem to know what time is, but as soon as we are forced to give an account of it, we are unable to define it without getting into serious difficulties.' But the fact that we cannot comprehend time does not mean that it has no existence, though that existence may be appearance, not reality.

Why, then, deny eternity on the ground that we cannot perceive or understand it? At any rate we know what it is *not*: it is not unending time. It is not time at all, but 'timelessness, something beyond time and incommensurable with it.' 'Eternal life,' therefore, would be something beyond time: you cannot 'spend' it, because it cannot become less. You can spend time, or money, but not eternity. Whatever it may be it is not 'endless duration'—that indeed would be a nightmare.

J. C. HARDWICK

CORRESPONDENCE

BRISTOL MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1952

At the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Somerville College last August was suggested that there must be numbers of the younger clergy and chers, particularly those with families, who in these days of rising costs find mselves unable to bear the expense of attendance at the Conference, and t others more fortunately endowed might wish to contribute to a small fund ich could be used to help those who have difficulties of this kind. The gestion was laid before the Conference members, and the response was ouraging enough to make me think that readers of your *Conference* number o were not present at Somerville would also wish to contribute.

Donations may be sent to, and will be gratefully acknowledged by, Miss ne Walker, Churchill Court, nr. Bristol.

A. W. Adams

Magdalen College, Oxford.

ELECTION TO THE COUNCIL OF THE M.C.U.

The Annual Meeting of the Union will be held early in June, and particulars be sent to members in due course. Nominations for election to the Council, the names of the seconders, should be sent to me to reach me not later April 30th.

The following retire after serving for three years on the Council, and not eligible for re-election, but may be co-opted for a year, viz.:—Miss M. Ashley, Rev. G. F. Handel Elvey, Rev. Colin King, Rev. L. C. kraft, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Mr. F. J. Richards, Mr. P. E. Wallis, Rev. J. S. Weir, and Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley.

The following retire after serving by co-option, and are eligible for election or co-option, viz.:—Rev. H. Bailey, Rev. F. E. Compton, Miss Elsie s, Mr. M. S. Gotch, Rev. J. D. Pearce Higgins, Mrs. M. C. Rose, C. E. Seamer, Rev. H. C. Snape, and Rev. P. Were.

There are ten vacancies to be filled by election, which is for a period of e years.

T. J. Wood,

Hon. Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Union

Charlbury Vicarage, Oxford.

CONFIRMATION AND HOLY COMMUNION

n your issue of last June you included an article on 'The Renaissance of D. Maurice.' And in your notes last December, under 'The Sin of ror,' you remark that Confirmation is not a necessary prerequisite for Communion; and on the next page you speak of Charles Kingsley as ost honest and fearless man.'

ow, a few years ago I happened to be lent a short biography of John ineau, a member of the famous Unitarian family who as a boy of fifteen as a pupil to Kingsley, and who is said in the standard *Life of Kingsley* ve been 'dear to him and his wife as a son.' In that book it was recorded Kingsley, after consultation with Maurice, admitted him to Communion out confirmation.'

I think this is worth giving wider publicity in your columns: first, as referring to a boy who was at least of a Unitarian family, then because of the record of Maurice's opinion, then because Kingsley acted on his own without apparently thinking it necessary to obtain episcopal or other permission. (Rev.) G. W. DAUGHLISH

We regret having to hold over additional correspondence due to lack of space.—ED., *M.C.*

LENTEN READING

Dr. C. J. Wright's inspiring little volume, *The Eternal Kingdom,* can now be obtained for 2/6 post free by application to the author: Rev. Dr. C. J. Wright, Barfreystone Rectory, Dover. — ED., *M.C.*

The Revised Burial Service, published in the December, 1951, *Modern Churchman,* embodying suggestions from correspondents, can be obtained in pamphlet form from the Holywell Press, Oxford (price 3*d.* a copy, or six copies for 1/-; postage additional).

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN, 1952

The 1952 Annual Modern Churchmen's Conference will be held at Wills Hall, Bristol, from Monday, September 8, to Friday, September 12. The Conference theme is: 'Christianity to-day: its Challenge and Opportunity.'

All applications for tickets should be addressed to the Hon. Sec. of the Conference:

Miss Irene Walker, F.R.Hist.Soc.
Churchill Court, Bristol

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

EASTER CONFERENCE, April 15th—18th, 1952, at OXFORD

Subject: THE BIBLE AND MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

Speakers:

Professor Driver	**Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley**
Rev. L. B. Cross	**Rev. George Suthers**

Cost: £2 11*s.* Applications to Rev. T. J. Wood, Charlbury Vicarage, Oxford

---